

Cage  
AS  
36  
Nb  
P455  
1986  
no.1

Perceptions of Preservice and  
Inservice Teachers: A Comparison of  
Factors That Relate to Teacher Burnout

A Thesis

Presented to

The Chancellor's Scholars Council  
of Pembroke State University

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for Completion of  
the Chancellor's Scholars Program

by

Laura Callahan

December 1, 1986

218996

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTERS: PAGES

1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.....	1
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	9
3. METHODS OF THE STUDY.....	22
4. RESULTS OF THE STUDY.....	29
5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS.....	60

### APPENDICES:

A.....	68
B.....	78
C.....	84
D.....	90

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	91
-----------------------	----

REFERENCES.....	92
-----------------	----

CHAPTER 1

## BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

### Introduction

It is very possible for a child who attends special classes to be taught by a special education teacher who really does not want to be teaching. According to Richard Schwab of the University of New Hampshire, many teachers, even those who started out "bright-eyed and dedicated", want to leave the profession(USA TODAY, 1985). Such is the case in the following example:

Four weeks into the school year, a first year teacher in a class for behaviorally disordered junior high school students had quit, too physically and emotionally exhausted to continue. By all accounts, she was well prepared for her job, having completed teacher preparation programs in both regular and special education. She had been a good student in her classes, had had successful experiences in student teaching, and had even worked as a teacher aid in a state hospital school during two previous summers. She was enthusiastic, appeared to have realistic expectations of what she was getting into, and wanted to teach behaviorally disordered children. In short, she showed considerable promise. Even so, she could not cope with the situation in which she found herself.

Tears came easily when she attempted to deal with the behavior of her students and when she talked to others about the problems she was having. She dreaded each new day and was so exhausted that she went to bed at 6 p.m.. Finally, with feelings of confusion and frustration, mixed with anger toward the students, administration, and most of all herself, she asked for a leave of absense(Zabel and Zabel, 1980, cited in Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1980).

Many teachers in our school today fully understand what it is like to be in a similar situation. An alarming number of teachers have been through or are going through the very same predicament. Some of these teachers are still in the classroom, others have resigned and are now in different occupations. They have all had to deal with the same

debilitating effects of the syndrome that many in the helping professions(i.e. careers where the workers are in constant contact with people) experience--job burnout. Although a great deal of research has been done in the area of burnout, no data exist today revealing the amount of teachers who are burned out. In 1978, though, it was estimated that six percent of the nations special education teachers were burned out in that year alone(cited in Ysseldyke and Alogizzine, 1980).

Job stress is an epidemic that is hitting our schools hard. Some feel that it may be the worst health problem that our teachers are facing today(Sylvester, 1977). In an address at a meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, teaching was described as "one of the three most potentially stressful occupations"(Hunter, 1977). The two that were considered to be more stressful than teaching are air traffic controllers and nurses and surgeons(Batten, 1985). Schools have also been singled out as one of the most "stressful ecologies in our society"(Halpin, Harris, and Halpin, 1981). Statistics show that stress affects more teachers today than in past years. A survey in 1978 indicated that seventy-eight percent of those polled experienced stress whereas in 1938, the figure was only 37.5 percent(Halpin, Harris, and Halpin, 1981).

Stress has been defined as "the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made on it"(Selye, 1976). McNerney defines it as the "body's physical, mental, and chemical reactions to circumstances that frighten, excite, confuse, endanger, or irritate(cited in Greenberg and Valletutti, 1980). According to Greenberg and Valletutti, stress is a "physical, mental, or emotional reaction resulting from an individuals response to environmental tensions, conflicts, and pressures". But stress can cause a negative reaction(distress) like tension or annoyance or a positive reaction like the motivation to achieve or testing one's potential to its

maximum. With burnout, stress is considered a negative reaction(distress).

The term burnout has also been defined in a variety of ways. Christina Maslach, one of the first psychologists to explore burnout defined it as:

a state of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do people work(Maslach, 1982).

She goes on to say that:

It [burnout] is a response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing with other human beings, particularly when they are troubled or having problems(Maslach, 1982).

According to Pines and Aronson, burnout is "characterized by physical depletion, by feelings of helplessness, by emotional drain, and by the development of negative attitudes toward work, life, and other people. [It is] a sense of distress, discontent, and failure in the quest for ideals"(1981). Burnout has also been defined as "the end result of unsuccessful attempts to come with a variety of negative stress conditions"(Shaw, et al., 1980). Others define it simply as "complete physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion"(Freudenberger, 1980; Hendrickson, 1979; Pines and Maslach, 1976). From these definitions, the researcher defines burnout as a person's inability to cope with an overload of negative stressful situations and the effect that inability has on the individual.

Teachers today are plagued with a host of stressful situations. All teachers, regular and special education, are confronted with the strict demands of the general public. Teachers are expected to be the "perfect" citizens in the community. They are scrutinized by the public more

closely than anyone else, except possibly ministers(Kiffs, 1986). It has been noted that the majority of the time, the public focuses of things that go wrong in our schools(Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1982). Also, pressure is put on teachers by parents of children who are not doing well in school. This is especially true in Special Education. Teachers are expected to be accountable for the learning of all students, without consideration of circumstances(Kiffs, 1986). Lack of job satisfaction, minimal administrative support, relatively low pay, and school violence are other variables that have been cited in the literature as possible causes of stress in teachers in general(Davis, 1983; Kiffs, 1986; McBride, 1983; Morsink, 1982; Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1983).

But special educators have additional variables that lead to stress and eventually burnout due to their roles and responsibilities as teachers of exceptional children(McBride, 1983, cited in Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1983; Weiskopf, 1980). These teachers spend the majority of their time in direct contact with their students. This allows them very little time to interact with regular teachers, thus causing feelings of isolation in special education teachers. Also, teachers of exceptional children see very little observable progress in their students. It takes special education students a longer time to accomplish a task than regular or gifted students because of this it takes a longer period of time for a special education to acknowledge achievement. This may affect the teacher's confidence and self-esteem.

Another factor of stress with special educators is the implementation of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. Since this law, the special education teacher's workload and roles as a teachers has changed drastically. They now have more paperwork and record-keeping responsibilities(i.e. planning and carrying out



individualized education programs(I.E.P.s for each child) plus they have to attend meetings and counsel parents.

Program structure is another factor that may be involved in burnout. A program that is flexible and less structured is needed to meet the individual needs of exceptional children, but a program of this sort is also more demanding on the teacher. Also, many special educators receive very little support or reinforcement from others. Usually, it is the responsibility of the special education teacher to be the one who gives all the support and reinforcement. This is viewed as another source of stress for them. Finally, weak and unclear role descriptions are also factors in burnout of special education teachers. Some special education teachers do not know or understand what is expected of them as teachers of exceptional children.

The effects of burnout begin as an emotional problem such as nervousness, worry, anxiety, irritability, energy deficiency, knots in the stomach, and difficulty in making the most minute decisions(Kiffs, 1986). As pressures mount and stress continues, the burned out teacher will develop behavioral problems like depression, discontent, robot-like behavior, angry outbursts, silence and withdrawal, detachment, cynicism, and suspiciousness(Truch, 1980). For some, behavioral changes include excessive use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs(Fimian, 1985). Eventually, burnout leads to physical problems such as headaches, sleeplessness, inability to shake colds, migraines, ulcers, heart trouble, high blood pressure, respiratory problems, and effects on sexual functioning(Kiffs, 1986). According to Hendrickson, "first things hurt in the mind and body; then they actually start to fall apart at school"(1979). As this happens, students become affected. Burned out teachers are "less creative, less



effective, and less concerned about their students"(cited in McBride, 1983). It also has been observed that these teachers are either overindulgent or too harsh toward their students(McBride, 1983, cited in Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1983). In the end, the teachers are not the only ones affected, but also her family, friends, and co-workers feel the effect of burnout.

#### Rationale for the Study

It is clear that something must be done to prevent burnout among educators. If burnout continues, the number of teachers leaving the profession may increase drastically.

Relaxation techniques, time management, team teaching, physical exercise, and the development of special interests or hobbies are just some of the suggestions given for preventing burnout. But many feel that prevention should begin before the teachers are in the classrooms(Eskridge and Coker, 1985; Farber, 1984; Gold, 1985; Truch, 1980; Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1982). These researchers believe that steps should be taken to combat stress while the teachers are still in college. According to Eskridge and Coker, "potential teachers must be shown the actualities of teaching so that they are fully aware of the daily conditions faced by the professional"(1985).

The teacher's training program is viewed as misleading and inadequate by many teachers and reseachers. In a study by Farber(1984), 68.8 percent of the teachers surveyed, reported that they either never or rarely felt that they were adequately prepared for the stress of teaching. Only sixteen percent of the teachers indicated that they frequently felt adequately trained. Sarasen, Davidson, and Blatt(1962), pointed out that "teachers are more painfully aware than any other group about the

inadequacies and irrelevancies of their training". Many teachers believe that what they are taught in college is unrelated to what they must actually do (Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1983). Gold (1985) reported that much of the time a teacher is either undertrained for his/her job or has been taught a false concept of how it is in the real world of teaching. Truch (1980) stated it directly:

...teacher training occurs in a vacuum. For four years, a potential teacher drags him- or herself through endless hours of classes, writes papers to which are attached marks and then for several weeks, the student undergoes a torturous, artificial period known as "student teaching". These few weeks are the closest that person comes to an actual classroom situation but, as all teachers know, it is not even close to being a realistic representation of teaching required in a classroom.

Teacher education is seen by many as inadequate, misleading, and irrelevant for those going into teaching.

With these views and reports in mind, the following research project was undertaken.

#### Description of the Project

The researcher designed this project to see if preservice special education teachers have realistic expectations of what their job's responsibilities as special education teachers will be. To find this out the researcher compared what inservice special education teachers identified as actual job responsibilities to what the preservice teachers identified as job responsibilities. These two groups of participants were chosen because of their accessibility to the researcher.

These preservice and inservice special education teachers were asked to fill out parallel questionnaires. The questions on the two questionnaires were derived from the six factors that may lead to stress in special education(i.e. work overload, lack of perceived success, constant direct contact with students, program structures, responsibilities for others, and role clarifications: See Appendix D). The first section of the two questionnaires, dealt solely with demographic information(e.g. age, sex, etc.). In the second section of the two questionnaires, both groups had to approximate the percentage of time spent on different job responsibilities. In the third section, the preservice and inservice teachers were asked to rate statements about a special education teacher's role and responsibilities on a five point Likert-type scale.

#### Summary

Chapter one includes the definition of burnout, different factors that may lead to burnout, and the symptoms of burnout. The rationale of this project and a general description of this project was also discussed in this chapter. Chapter two will consist of a review of the literature on burnout. Chapter three will contain the methods used in this study. In Chapter four, the results of the project will be given. Chapter five will include a discussion of these results.

CHAPTER 2

The first of the great events of the American Revolution was the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. This document declared the thirteen colonies to be free and independent states, no longer subject to British rule. The Declaration was signed by John Hancock, who placed his signature in large, bold letters at the top of the document. Other signatories included John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and many others. The Declaration was a bold statement of the colonies' desire for self-government and independence from Britain.

## CHAPTER 2

The second of the great events of the American Revolution was the Battle of Bunker's Neck on September 11, 1776. This battle was a tactical draw, but it was a significant victory for the Continental Army. The British had been pursuing the Continental Army, and the battle of Bunker's Neck was the last major battle of the Revolutionary War. The Continental Army, led by General George Washington, managed to hold off the British, allowing them to escape to Philadelphia and then to Lancaster and York. The battle of Bunker's Neck was a turning point in the war, as it showed that the Continental Army was capable of standing up to the British in a conventional battle.

The third of the great events of the American Revolution was the signing of the Treaty of Paris on September 3, 1783. This treaty ended the Revolutionary War and recognized the United States as an independent nation. The treaty was signed by John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and John Jay on behalf of the United States, and by Lord Shelburne on behalf of Great Britain. The treaty established the boundaries of the new nation, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River, and from the 33rd to the 49th parallel north. The Treaty of Paris was a landmark event in American history, as it marked the birth of the United States as a sovereign nation.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past fifty years, researchers have examined the effects of occupational stress on individuals (McBride, 1980). It has only been within the last decade that burnout was acknowledged as a syndrome. Prior to 1974, there are no references on the subject of burnout in journals, magazines, or books (Perlman and Hartman, 1982). The term burnout was first used by Dr. Herbert Freudenberger to describe the results of job stress on his patients who were staff members at alternative institutions (Lawrenson and McKinnon, 1982). Since Freudenberger's invention of the term, burnout has been used repeatedly to describe the effects of negative stress on those who are in the helping professions (i.e. social workers, teachers, nurses, psychologists, counselors, etc.).

Christine Maslach has also contributed to the research on burnout. Most of her work dealt with the helping professions in general and with the levels of stress professionals in these fields experience. She has also developed a stress inventory which assesses the different aspects of burnout experienced by those in the helping professions. Most of the current research on burnout in education is because of Maslach's earlier work in this area.

Since all earlier research on burnout dealt primarily with the helping professions in general, there is a limited amount of research dealing with burnout in education. The study of burnout in teaching has only recently begun (Fimian, Pierson, and McHardy, 1986). Because research on burnout in education is in its infancy stages, very few studies have been done in the field of special education. The first studies of burnout in education focused primarily on Regular classroom teachers, not special education teachers.

## TEACHER BURNOUT IN REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Most of the studies on burnout in Regular classroom teachers focus solely on the sources and symptoms of burnout. But it is because of these studies on the sources and symptoms of burnout in Regular classroom teachers that the foundation was provided for the research on burnout in special education. The majority of the sources and symptoms found in Regular education have also been applied to special education.

In 1980, Schwab and Iwanicki conducted a study to examine whether teacher background variables (i.e. sex, age, level of education, marital status, etc.) were related to the amount of variance in teacher perceived burnout. In the study, four hundred and sixty-nine randomly selected Massachusetts regular classroom teachers who worked with children in grades K-12 were given the Teacher Stress Survey. The Teacher Stress Survey included the Maslach Burnout Inventory, which assesses the three aspects of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment, and a background information section. The results showed teacher background variables were responsible for a significant but small amount of variance in both the Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment subscales. Background variables of Sex, Grade Level Taught, and Age resulted in a larger amount of variance in the Depersonalization subscale. The study found that teachers in the twenty to thirty-nine year old age bracket had more intense feelings of fatigue and exhaustion than did the fifty year old teachers. In the Depersonalization subscale, Sex resulted in the most variance. It was revealed that men had more frequent and intense negative feelings toward their students than women in this study. Grade Level Taught was another background variable that resulted in

a significant amount of variance in both Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment subscales. Results showed that teachers working in the junior high middle schools and in the high schools felt more negative feelings towards their students than did elementary school teachers. High school teachers also indicated fewer feelings of personal accomplishment in their profession. Other findings in the study revealed that the background variables of Marital Status, Teaching Experience, Educational Level, and Community Type did not account for a significant amount of variance in the levels of burnout among Regular teachers.

Another study of burnout in regular education teachers was conducted in 1977 by Kyriacou and Sutcliffe. The purpose of the study was to investigate the prevalence, sources, and symptoms of stress using two hundred and fifty-seven school teachers from sixteen medium-sized schools in England (the results found in this study were very similar to the results found in American studies on burnout). The teachers had to complete a questionnaire that consisted of four sections. The first section requested biographical information; the second section consisted of fifty-one items relating to the sources of stress; the third section had the sample of teachers responding to how stressful it was being a teacher; and the fourth section included seventeen items regarded as symptoms of stress. Results indicated that approximately twenty percent of the teachers rated being a teacher as either very stressful or extremely stressful. Sources of stress for these teachers included pupils' poor attitude to work, trying to uphold/maintain values and standards, and covering lessons for absent teachers. Also, the study revealed that female teachers experienced more stress regarding pupil misbehavior than males, whereas males reported greater stress for administrative work and paperwork. The study also showed that younger and less experienced teachers reported greater stress on items like: punishing pupils, difficult classes, and maintaining class discipline than



did older, experienced teachers. Finally, the study showed that the most frequent symptoms of stress experienced were feelings of exhaustion and feelings of frustration.

In a study by Raschke, Dedrick, Strathe, and Hawkes, two hundred and thirty, K-6 public school teachers from the central Midwest responded to a mailed survey concerning the state of teaching, job stress, and job satisfaction. The survey included a five part questionnaire dealing with specific issues related to elementary teacher stress. The study showed that the majority of these teachers surveyed felt that public respect for education had declined during the past fifteen years. The results also indicated that these elementary teachers ranked 'lack of time to accomplish tasks', 'disruptive students', and 'non-teaching duties' as sources of job stress. The study also revealed that students, colleagues, and summer vacations were things that the teachers liked about their jobs. Whereas, paperwork, non-teaching duties, and administration were things that the teachers disliked about their jobs.

In another study of burnout in regular teachers, Whiteman and Young(1983) compared the extent to which teachers were experiencing burnout to their perception of others. One hundred and twenty-five elementary school teachers from southwest Louisiana were asked to complete two questionnaires. One questionnaire was a Self Diagnosis Instrument which indicated to what extent the participant felt such feelings as anxiety, helplessness, and depression. The other questionnaire was the Paired Hands Test-Elementary which measures ones' general perceptions about other people on a positive to negative continuum. Results indicated that as the teacher's experiences of burnout increases, the teacher's perception of others becomes more negative and hostile. This study implied that burnout may have a negative impact on a teacher's attitudes toward his/her students. As the teacher's burnout becomes more severe,

his/her interpretation of a student's behavior becomes more negative.

Finally, in a rare survey conducted by Abernathy, Manera, and Wright(1984), one hundred and seventy-five student teachers and one hundred and five cooperating Regular classroom teachers were interviewed to determine stress related factors for university students during student teaching. The two groups were given thirteen stress factors and were asked to rank them from most to least stressful for student teachers. The data revealed that the two groups agreed exactly on six of the thirteen factors with the top four stressors identically ranked and were close on the other seven. The study showed that cooperating teachers know of the stress factors in the student teaching experience.

These studies have shown the different sources and symptoms of burnout. The first study cited revealed that certain background variables(i.e sex, age, and grade level taught) were related to the amount of variance in perceived teacher burnout. The second study found that for teachers from England the sources of stress that lead to burnout included pupil's poor attitudes, trying to uphold/maintain values and standards, and covering lessons for absent teachers. It also indicated that sources of stress differed between females and males and between inexperienced and experienced teachers. Feelings of exhaustion and feelings of fatigue were revealed as symptoms of stress. In the third study, sources of stress that lead to burnout included lack of time to accomplish tasks, disruptive students, and nonteaching duties. The fourth study showed that as a teacher's experience of burnout increases, the more negative his/her attitudes become towards others. And finally, the last study indicated that supervising teachers are well aware of the stress factors in student teaching.

These studies are only a few selected examples of the research that

has examined burnout in regular classroom teachers. They have shown the general stress factors that lead to burnout for all teachers. But special education teachers have to deal with these stressful factors plus others.

## TEACHER BURNOUT IN SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Although research on burnout in special education has practically just started, the number of research studies is rapidly increasing. Some studies have dealt with the subject of burnout in special education teachers in a broad and general manner. Other researchers have pinpointed and examined specific sources of burnout in special education teachers. A few studies have explored specific areas of special education (i.e. Learning Disabilities, Emotionally Disturbed, etc.), examining their relationship with burnout. And in some instances, investigations on burnout have included preservice and inexperienced teachers. The following studies are divided into these four categories mentioned above.

### General Studies on Burnout in Special Education

In a study by Bradfield and Fones (1985), sixty special education teachers from Northern California were surveyed to determine the extent these special education teachers experienced stress as a result of their jobs and life events that cause stress. Each teacher was asked to complete the Life Stress Scale II, a Social Readjustment Scale, the Wilson Stress Profile for Teachers, a Health Status Questionnaire, and an Exercise Questionnaire. Bradfield and Fones (1985) found that seventy-five percent of these teachers indicated that they experienced "moderate" amounts of stress, with ten percent indicating "high" levels of stress,

and fifteen percent having "low" levels of stress. Results showed that these teachers felt the greatest amount of stress in their relationship with their students' parents. Time management and intrapersonal conflicts were also areas of stress for these teachers. The study also revealed that more than forty percent of these teachers experienced stress outside their jobs. In the study, the high stress teachers were found to have twice as many physical distress symptoms than the low stress teachers. The high stress teachers indicated that they required more than three times as many sick days on the average as the low stress teachers. The data also showed that forty-three percent of the high stress group planned on changing careers, while only eight percent in the low stress group indicated such plans.

In another study of burnout in special education teachers, Fimian and Santoro(1983) examined the sources and manifestations of stress in three hundred and sixty-five full time special education teachers from Connecticut. Each participant was given the Teacher Stress Inventory. This inventory consisted of five sections: Personal Information; Professional Information; Sources of Stress; Emotional and Behavioral Manifestations of Stress; and Physiological Manifestations of Stress. Information from the study showed that of the three hundred and sixty-five respondents, fifty-seven were identified as high-stress, two hundred as moderate-stress and fifty-eight as low-stress teachers. Almost half(49.3%) of these teachers indicated that they regularly took mental health days due to job-related stress. The results also showed that fifty-six percent of these teachers felt that their previous training did not prepare them for their teaching duties. These teachers rated lack of recognition, professional time demands, inadequate salaries, teaching poorly motivated students, constant monitoring pupil behavior and inadequate discipline policies as main sources of stress.

Fimian and Santoro's(1983) study also revealed that many of these

teachers exhibited emotional, behavioral and physiological manifestation of stress. The six strongest emotional manifestations reported were frustration, mental exhaustion, excessively worried, and feeling pressured, depressed, and anxious. Acting defensively with others, sleeping more usual, allowing one's social and professional performance to deteriorate and dealing with one's students on only an intellectual and nonpersonal basis were all showed to be behavioral manifestations of the teachers survey. Physiological manifestations of the teachers due to stress included physical exhaustion, headaches, physical weakness, stomach acid, and feeling one's heart pounding or racing.

The studies cited in this section have given an overview of the sources and symptoms of stress that lead to burnout for special education teachers. From the different sources of burnout found in these studies, other researchers have pinpointed specific sources and carefully examined them.

#### Specific Sources of Burnout In Special Education Teachers

Instead of studying the subject of burnout in a general way, some reseachers have carefully looked at specific sources of stress that leads to burnout for special education teachers like the demands of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and the relationship of role ambuguity and role conflict to burnout. The following studies provide and indepth examination for these specific sources.

Bensky, Shaw, Gouse, Bates, Dixon, and Beane conducted a study to investigate the relationship of stress to educators and Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. One hundred and fourteen full time professional educators enrolled in special education classes at



three universities in Connecticut participated in the study. The sample included 58.7 percent special education teachers and 41.3 percent regular classroom teachers. These teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire which inquired about the degree and type of stress they experience, compliance with Public Law 94-142 mandates, and specific causes of stress for them.

Results showed that there were various stress factors related to the law. Conducting a placement team meeting for each exceptional student, maintaining data for each student, and preparing Individualized Education Programs(I.E.P.s) for each student were all considered as stress factors that may lead to burnout. Results indicated that as a school's compliance with the specific mandates of the law increased, the stress from specific P.L. 94-142 tasks such as writing I.E.P.s and doing due process paperwork increased. The study also revealed that if the teacher had an unclear understanding of what was expected of him/her, the greater the teacher's perception of job-related stress.

In a study by Crane and Iwanicki(1986), four hundred and forty-three special education teachers from Connecticut were surveyed to examine the relationship of role conflict and role ambiguity to burnout. These teachers were asked to fill out the Stress Survey for Special Education. This survey included the Maslach Burnout Inventory, which measured perceived burnout, a personal information sheet, and the Role Questionnaire, which measured the degree of role conflict and role ambiguity.

The results indicated that role conflict and role ambiguity were related significantly to burnout among special education teachers. Role conflict accounted for the most variance in Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales of the Maslach's Burnout Inventory, whereas, role ambiguity accounted for a significant variance in the Personal

Accomplishment subscale. The data also revealed that special education teachers in self-contained classrooms showed significantly higher levels of the three aspects of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) than did resource room teachers. Finally, the study found that older (46+ years) and more experienced (10+ years) teachers exhibited significantly lower levels of the three aspects of burnout than did younger, less experienced teachers.

The first study in this section of the specific sources of burnout for special education teachers revealed that Public Law 94-142 did produce various stress factors that could result in burnout such as conduction placement meetings, maintaining data and preparing I.E.P.s for special education teachers. The second study indicated that role conflict and role ambiguity did relate to burnout in special education teachers. Whereas these studies dealt primarily with the specific sources of burnout, some studies have examined burnout in specific areas of special education.

#### Burnout In Specific Areas of Special Education

The following studies deal with the causes and symptoms of burnout in the areas of Learning Disabilities and the Emotionally Handicapped in special education. These studies show that each of these areas of special education has its own particular causes of burnout among for its teachers.

Olson and Matuskey (1983) conducted a survey to investigate the causes of burnout in specific learning disabilities (SLD) teacherws. One hundred and seventy-three SLD teachers from florida filled out a two-page questionnaire. The first page consisted of personal background information such as sex, age, years of teaching, highest degree held, and



level of teaching. The second page of the questionnaire included a list of thirty possible sources of stress which the participants had to rate from not applicable(0) to high levels of stress(4).

The study revealed that there are job-related factors that produced stress in SLD teachers. The six sources of stress identified by these SLD teachers were excessive paperwork, inadequate salaries, discipline of students, inadequate planning time, student attitude, and pupil-teacher ratio.

In another study, Lawrenson and McKinnon(1980) surveyed thirty-three teachers of the emotionally disturbed to find out more about teacher attrition and burnout in this particular group of special education teachers. Each participant was asked to complete a survey form that included questions on personal data, employment experience, teacher preparation, and reasons for leaving a job. The teachers were also asked to rate the quality of job support services, their knowledge of theories of teaching, and their job satisfactions and dissatisfactions.

Results showed that forty-eight percent of the teachers had resigned in the three-year period of the study. The major reason given for leaving the job was the same as the major dissatisfactions, "hassles with the administration". "Better job opportunity" and "move to be closer to the family" were the other highest ranking variables in leaving the job. The study showed that the highest ranked job satisfaction was "relationship with students". "self achievement" was ranked the second highest. Teachers viewed student growth as a measure of their own personal achievement, thus saw self-achievement as a satisfaction. Lack of administrative support was listed as the number one job dissatisfaction with inconsistent support staff and clerical and paperwork as the second and third job dissatisfactions.

The results found by Olson and Matuskey(1982) and by Lawrenson and

McKinnon(1982) are similar to the results found in studies of other areas of special education(Davis,1983; Fimian, Pierson, and Hardy,1986; Weiskopf,1980). The other studies of areas in special education reveal that each specific area whether it be Learning Disabilities or the Severe and Profoundly Handicapped, all have problems that are found for all special education teachers plus problems that deal only with a particular area of special education.

#### Burnout In Special Education Teacher Trainees and First Year Teachers

In a rare study of burnout in special education teacher trainees and inexperienced teachers, Fimian and Blanton surveyed three hundred and seventy-nine teacher trainees and thirty-six first year teachers. All the subjects were either enrolled at Appalachian State University in North Carolina or were alumnae of the university. All participants had to fill out a personal information sheet, the Role Questionnaire which measured the degree of role conflict and role ambiguity existing in the job or placement, the Teacher Stress Inventory which assessed the stress experienced in thirty-eight stressful events, and the Maslach's Burnout Inventory. The teacher trainees rated the inventories in relation to their experiences in special education classes.

Role ambiguity and role conflict were found as contributors of burnout in the trainees, while only role conflict contributed to burnout in the teachers. Results showed that inexperienced teachers and trainees are subject to no more, but no less, stress than that typically encountered by experienced teachers. Results also indicated that trainees reported more problems with stress manifestations than with stress sources. But the first year teachers reported significantly stronger

stress sources and experienced them more often than did the teacher trainees. This study also showed that certain variables such as personal, academic, and organizational ones did not predict stress frequency, stress strength, or burnout intensity.

## Summary

Chapter two has reviewed the literature related to the issue of teacher burnout. The review began with the history of the term burnout. Next, there was a review of the literature that dealt with burnout in regular education. The studies found that there are key stress factors that lead to burnout in Regular teachers such as pupil misbehavior, paperwork and non teaching duties. The remainder of the chapter was devoted to a review of the literature on burnout in special education. The studies were divided into four different categories: 1) general studies on burnout in special education; 2) specific sources of stress in special education; 3) burnout in specific areas of special education; and 4) burnout in special education teacher trainees and first-year teachers. These studies revealed that some of the sources for burnout in special education included excessive paperwork, problems with administration, role ambiguity, and inadequate salaries. Chapter three will describe the specific methods used for this study. Chapter four will contain the results of the research. Chapter five will be a discussion of the results.

The first of these is the fact that the...  
the second is the fact that the...  
the third is the fact that the...

CHAPTER 3

The first of these is the fact that the...  
the second is the fact that the...  
the third is the fact that the...

CHAPTER 3

The first of these is the fact that the...  
the second is the fact that the...  
the third is the fact that the...

The first of these is the fact that the...  
the second is the fact that the...  
the third is the fact that the...

## INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 presented the review of the literature related to burnout in education. This chapter will be a detailed description of the procedures used in this project.

## MATERIALS

This project involved the development of two questionnaires, a teacher questionnaire and a student questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questions on the questionnaires (both the teacher's and the student's) deal with factors that relate to burnout in special education. They were derived from the research that dealt with the sources of burnout (Bradfield and Fones, 1985; Crane and Iwanicki, 1986; Fimian and Blanton, 1986; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1978; Lawrenson and McKinnon, 1982; McBride, 1983; Olson and Matuskey, 1982; Weiskopf, 1980; Wilson, 1979).

The two questionnaires are parallel, with the first question on the student's questionnaire corresponding to the first question on the teacher's questionnaire. This is done throughout the two questionnaires. The teacher's questionnaire had the teachers answering the questions in relation to what they actually do. The students had to answer their questionnaire in relation to how they think something is done by a special education teacher.

A packet was prepared for each participant in the study (see Appendix A). Each packet included a cover sheet, an information sheet (first section of the questionnaire), and a two part questionnaire (second and third sections of the questionnaire). The cover sheet explained the reason of the questionnaire (as part of the requirements of the Chancellor's Scholars Program) and the purpose of the questionnaire (to compare the perceptions of special education inservice teachers with those of special education preservice teachers).

The topic of burnout was not mentioned as a reason for the

questionnaire. The researcher felt that this might affect how the participants filled out the questionnaires. The teacher's information sheet asked for the teacher's age, sex, years in teaching special education, total years in teaching, highest degree held, grade level taught, type of students, type of special education class taught, and the number of students taught per day. The student's information sheet requested the student's age, sex, classification, type of special education class they want to work in(i.e. Resource or Self-Contained), grade level they want to work with, and type of student(s) they want to work with(i.e. Educable Mentally Handicapped, Learning Disabled, etc.). The second section of the questionnaire had the respondents fill in the percentage of the day or week (as indicated in the question) a certain activity was carried out with the exception of the first question.

For the teachers, the first question asked if they were currently planning to remain in the classroom. For the students, the first question wanted to know if once teaching, did they plan to remain in the classroom. Question 2 through Question 8 dealt with the percentage of time a teacher spends on paperwork, doing non-academic activities(such as hall duty, etc.), having the students in his/her classroom for whom he/she is responsible, in actual teaching, working with regular teachers or other school personnel, assessing and diagnosing, and in consultation with students' parents. The teachers had to give a percentage for how much time is spent on the various activities, whereas the students had to give a percentage on the time they thought was spent on each activity. The third section of the questionnaires was a series of eight five point Likert-type scale in which the participants had to rate each statement from Strongly Agree(1) to Strongly Disagree(5). The statements included comments about the recognition of special education teachers,

understanding of the role as a special education teacher, satisfaction of student progress, interaction with regular teachers, ability to set up schedules in the classroom, support of administration, regular teachers, students, and parents, ability to keep up with the rules, policies, and procedures, and the time spent away from students. Again, the students had to rate the statements in view of how they felt it was for special education teachers.

## SUBJECTS

The subjects consisted of two groups of participants. The first group were twenty preservice teachers (students) attending Pembroke State University. All of the preservice teachers were enrolled in Special Education courses at the time of the study. The second group consisted of twenty-nine special education inservice teachers from Scotland County. This county is within an approximate twenty-five mile radius from Pembroke State University. The participation in the study was completely voluntary for both groups of participants.

Everyone in the group of preservice teachers chose to participate. Of the twenty respondents who were surveyed, nineteen were females with only one male in the group. The ages of the preservice teachers ranged from nineteen to fifty-three with sixteen of them ranging in age from nineteen to twenty-four and four ranging in age from thirty-seven to fifty-three. Of the group, seven were classified as juniors, six as sophmores, five as seniors, one as a freshman, and one was back for certification. Nine of



the preservice teachers indicated that they would like to work in a Resource room(students are in the class up to fifty percent of the school day) and eleven wanted to work in a Self-Contained class(students are in the class more than fifty percent of the day).

Five of the preservice teachers wanted to work in the K-6 grade level, another five wanted K-3, four desired the 10-12 grade level, three were for the 7-9 grade level, one wanted the 7-12 grade level, another one indicated a choice between either K-3 grade level or 7-9 grade level, and one indicated no preference for any specific grade level.

In the group of preservice teachers, seven indicated a desire to work with Learning Disabled(LD) students, three with Educable Mentally Handicapped(EMH) students, three with Trainable Mentally Handicapped(TMH) students, two wanted to work with both LD students and EMH students, another wanted to work with EMH and TMH students, one wanted TMH and LD students, one indicated a combination of LD, EMH, and Emotionally Handicapped(EH) students, and another wanted to work with Visually Impaired students.

In the group of inservice teachers, twenty-nine out of forty-two (69%) chose to participate in the study. Of the twenty-nine inservice teachers, twenty-seven were females and two were males. The age range of the inservice teachers was from twenty-four to forty-seven. Ten ranged in age from twenty-four to twenty-nine, thirteen from thirty to thirty-nine, five from forty to forty-seven and one did not indicate his/her age. Seventeen of these inservice teachers had Bachelor of Science(BS) degrees, six had Bachelor of Arts(BA) degrees, four had Master of Arts(MA) degrees, and two had Master of Science(MS) degrees.

The number of total years these inservice teachers had taught ranged

from one year to twenty years. The average number of total years taught was 7.8 years. The number of years these inservice teachers taught in special education ranged from one to fifteen years. The average number of years taught in special education was seven years.

Seventeen of these inservice teachers worked in a resource room while twelve worked in a Self-Contained room. The inservice teachers taught anywhere between five students per day to forty-eight students per day with an average of eighteen students per day.

Eight of the inservice teachers worked in the K-5 grade level, five in the 6-8 grade level, six in the 9-12 grade level, six in ungraded classes, one in the K-8 grade levels, and three in the K-12 grade levels. Some of these teachers worked at more than one school like the visually impaired teachers and the hearing impaired teachers.

In the group of inservice teachers, eight worked with EMH students, four with a combination of EMH, LD, and the Academically Gifted(AG) students, four with both EMH and LD students, three worked with TMH students, two with hearing impaired students, two with speech impaired students, one worked with visually impaired students, one with Multi-handicapped students, one with Severe and Profound students, one with Autistic students, one worked with both TMH and Behaviorally and Emotionally Handicapped students, and one respondent did not indicate the type of student he/she taught.

## PROCEDURES

In April of 1986, the researcher administered the Student Questionnaire to all Special Education majors who were enrolled in Special Education classes (except those who were doing their student teaching) at

Pembroke State University. Participation in the study was completely voluntary. The researcher distributed and collected the questionnaires herself. It took approximately ten to fifteen minutes for each preservice teacher(student) to complete the questionnaire.

To administer the Teacher Questionnaire, the researcher contacted Mr. Julian Butler, the Director of Exceptional Children in Scotland County in May of 1986. Mr. Butler distributed the questionnaires via the Departmental Correspondence in June of 1986 to all(forty-two) teachers teaching exceptional children in Scotland County. Each teacher was asked to complete the questionnaire and return it to the Exceptional Children's Office for collection. Twenty-nine out of the forty-two teachers (69%) returned the questionnaires to Mr. Butler within two weeks of distribution. The researcher was advised by Mr. Butler not to expect the return of any questionnaires after two weeks because school would be out for the summer.

Appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were used for the demographic information and for the questions in Section II and Section III. Inferential statistics (Chi-square) were used for the statements in Section III.

The overall scores for the inservice teachers and the preservice teachers were compared. Then the preservice teachers and the inservice teachers were separated according to type of class, Resource or Self-Contained, and then compared. The Resource room inservice teachers' answers were compared to the answers of those preservice teachers who chose Resource room. The same comparisons were made with the Self-Contained inservice teachers and preservice teachers.

## SUMMARY

Chapter 3 has described the materials, subjects, and procedures used in this study. Chapter 4 will give the results of the study. Chapter 5 will be a discussion of the results.

The first of these is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The second is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The third is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

CHAPTER 4

# CHAPTER 4

The first of these is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The second is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The third is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

The first of these is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The second is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The third is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

## INTRODUCTION

In chapter one the definitions, causes, and symptoms of burnout were given. Chapter one also included the rationale for this study. Chapter two presented a review of the relevant literature on burnout. Chapter three discussed the methods and procedures used in the study. This chapter will present the analysis of the results.

## DEMOGRAPHIC RESULTS

The questionnaires were completed by forty-nine inservice and preservice teachers. Twenty of them were preservice teachers, students majoring in Special Education at Pembroke State University and 29 were inservice teachers working in Scotland County.

In the student sample, 95 percent were females and 5 percent were males. Eighty percent of the student participants ranged in age from nineteen to twenty-four years and 20 percent ranged in age from thirty-seven to fifty-three years. Of the group, 35 percent were classified as Juniors, 30 percent as sophmores, 25 percent as seniors, and 5 percent were freshman or back for certification. Fifty-five percent wanted to work in a self-contained classroom and 45 percent wanted to work in a Resource room.

In the group of students, 35 percent indicated a desire to work with Learning Disabled(LD) students, 15 percent wanted to work with Educable Mentally Handicapped(EMH) students, 15 percent wanted to work with Trainable Mentally Handicapped(TMH) students, 10 percent wanted to work with both LD and EMH students, and 5 percent wanted to work with a combination of LD, EMH, and Emotionally Handicapped(EH) students. Another 5 percent wanted to work with both TMH and LD, 5 percent wanted to work with EMH and TMH, 5 percent wanted TMH and the Severe and Profoundly

Mentally Handicapped(S/PMH) students, and 5 percent wanted to work with the visually impaired students.

While 25 percent of the preservice teachers indicated a desire to work at both the Primary(K-3) and Intermediate(4-6) grade levels, another 25 percent wanted the Primary(K-3) grade level, 20 percent chose the Senior high(10-12) grade level, 15 percent wanted the middle grades (7-9), 5 percent wanted the middle grades (7-9) and the Senior high(10-12) grade level, 5 percent indicated either the Primary(K-3) grades or the middle grades (7-9), and 5 percent gave no specific grade level choice.

In the teacher sample, 93 percent were females and 7 percent were males. Forty-five percent of the teachers ranged in age from thirty to thirty-nine years, 34 percent ranged in age from twenty-four to twenty-nine years, 17 percent were forty or over, and 3 percent(one participant) did not indicate his/her age. Of the group, 58.6 percent held Bachelor of Science(BS) degrees, 20.6 percent held Bachelor of Arts(BA) degrees, 13.7 percent held Master of Arts(MA) degrees, and 6.8 percent held Master of Science(MS) degrees.

The total years these teachers had taught ranged from one to twenty years. Twenty-four percent had taught between one to five years, 62 percent had taught for more than five years to ten years, and 4 percent indicated that they had taught sixteen or more years. No one indicated that they had taught eleven to fifteen years. The years these teachers had taught in special education ranged from one to fifteen years. Thirty-one percent of these inservice teachers taught between one and five years in special education, 55 percent indicated that they had taught for more than five years to ten years in special education, and 14 percent had taught between eleven and fifteen years in special education. Sixty-six



percent had only taught in special education, while 34 percent were teaching in special education but had taught in some other area, also.

In the group of inservice teachers, 59 percent were Resource room teachers and 41 percent were self-contained classroom teachers. The number of students that these teachers taught per day ranged from five to forty-eight students. Thirty-one percent taught between five to ten students per day, 24 percent taught from eleven to twenty students per day, 17 percent taught between twenty-one and thirty students per day, 21 percent taught from thirty-one to forty-eight students per day, and 7 percent did not indicate the amount of students taught per day.

Of this group of inservice teachers, 28 percent indicated that they worked with the Educable Mentally Handicapped(EMH) students, 14 percent worked with both EMH and Learning Disabled(LD) students, another 14 percent worked with a combination of EMH, LD, and Academically Gifted(AG) students, 10 percent worked with Trainable Mentally Handicapped(TMH) students, 7 percent worked with hearing impaired students, another 7 percent worked with speech impaired students, 7 percent worked with Severe and Profoundly Mentally Handicapped(S/PMH) students, 3 percent worked with visually impaired students, 3 percent worked with Autistic students, another 3 percent worked with both TMH and Behaviorally and Emotionally Handicapped(BEH) students, and 3 percent did not indicate the type of student he/she worked with.

This sample of inservice teachers worked in a variety of different grade levels. Twenty-eight percent worked in the K-5 grade level, 21 percent worked in the 9-12 grade level, another 21 percent indicated that they worked in ungraded classrooms, 17 percent worked in the 6-8 grade level, 10 percent indicated that they worked at all the grade levels(K-12), and 3 percent worked in the K-8 grade level.

According to the data, most of the preservice teachers were females between the ages of nineteen to twenty-four years and were classified as juniors. The majority of them wanted to work in a self-contained classroom, teach LD students, and work at Primary(K-3) and Intermediate(4-6) grade levels or at Primary(K-3) grade level.

Also, according to the data, most of the inservice teachers were females between the ages of thirty to thirty-nine years, held a Bachelor of Science(BS) degree, and had only taught in special education. The majority of them worked in Resource rooms, taught one to ten students per day, worked with EMH students, and worked in the K-5 grade level.

## SECTION II RESULTS

## INTRODUCTION

This section contains the descriptive analysis for Section II of the questionnaires, which compares the results of all the inservice teachers with those of the preservice teachers(students). Analysis will be made of the results between inservice self-contained classroom teachers and students who wanted to work in self-contained classrooms(The researcher will refer to the students as preservice self-contained classroom teachers). Comparisons will also be made of the results between inservice Resource room teachers and students who wanted to work in Resource rooms(the researcher will refer to the students as preservice Resource room teachers). Inferential analysis, Chi-square, could not be used to analyze the data in Section II except for the first question, because too many cells had expected frequencies of less than five. Thus, using Chi-square would exaggerate the results. There did not appear to be a logical way to collapse the cells so that Chi-square could be used to analyze the responses. The actual number of the specific answers chosen for each question are contained in Tables A-X in Appendix B.

## SECTION II RESULTS

For question one in Section II, the inservice teachers were asked: "Are you currently planning to remain in the classroom?". The overall descriptive results were as follows: 89.6 percent indicated "yes"; 3 percent said "no"; and 6.8 percent were "undecided". The preservice teachers(students) were asked: "Once teaching, do you plan to remain in the classroom?". The overall descriptive results were: 60 percent said "yes"; 10 percent indicated "no"; and 30 percent were "undecided". Chi-square analysis indicated ( $\chi^2=5.98;n.s.$ ) there was no difference in the

way preservice teachers and inservice teachers responded to this question. Results came very close to showing a difference because of the number of preservice teachers who indicated "undecided" as their answer.

When comparing the inservice self-contained classroom teachers to the preservice self-contained classroom teachers in question one of Section II, the results were somewhat similar to the overall results. The descriptive analysis for the inservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that all(100%) said "yes" to this first question. Whereas, descriptive analysis for the preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 63.6 percent said "yes"; 18.1 percent were "undecided"; and 18.1 percent indicated "no". Chi-square analysis indicated( $\chi^2 = 4.93; n.s.$ ) that there was no significant difference in the way inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers responded to this question.

For comparisons on this first question in Section II between inservice Resource room teachers and preservice Resource room teachers, results were different from the other two comparisons. The descriptive results for the inservice Resource room teachers were as follows: 82 percent indicated "yes"; 5.8 percent were "undecided"; and 11.7 percent said "no". The descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 55.5 percent said "yes" and 44 percent were "undecided". No one chose "no" as an answer. Chi-square analysis indicated( $\chi^2 = 6.38; p < .05$ ) that there was difference in the way inservice Resource room teachers and preservice Resource room teachers responded to this question. More students than expected were undecided about remaining in the classroom once teaching.

For question two, inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend on paperwork(such as writing

I.E.P.s and completing the necessary forms)?". Overall descriptive results indicated that 31 percent of the inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent doing paperwork; 24 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 17 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 10 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; 13.7 percent indicated (e)40-49% of the day; and 3 percent said (i)80-89% of the day. No one chose (f)50-59%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%. The preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends on paperwork(such as writing I.E.P.s and completing the necessary forms)?". Overall descriptive results showed that 5 percent of the preservice teachers thought special education teachers spend (a)0-9% of the day on paperwork; another 5 percent thought (b)10-19% of the day; 20 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 30 percent indicated (d)30-39% of the day; 20 percent felt it was (e)40-49% of the day; 10 percent chose (f)50-59% of the day; and another 10 percent chose (i)80-89% of the day. None of these preservice teachers chose (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive results for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the second question in Section II showed that 25 percent of these teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent on paperwork; another 25 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 16.6 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; 8 percent chose (d)30-39% of the day; and 25 percent indicated (e)40-49% of the day. No one chose (f)50-59% through (j)90-100%. For preservice self-contained classroom teachers, descriptive analysis indicated that 9 percent of these preservice teachers thought special education teachers in self-contained classrooms spend (a)0-9% of the day on paperwork; another 9 percent thought (b)10-19% of the day; 18 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; 36 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; 18 percent said (e)40-49% of the day; and 9 percent indicated (i)80-89% of

the day. None of these preservice teachers chose (f)50-59%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers on the second question in Section II indicated that 35 percent of these inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent on paperwork; 23.5 percent said it was (b)10-19% of the day; 17.6 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; 11.7 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; 5.8 percent chose (e)40-49% of the day; and another 5.8 percent said (i)80-89% of the day. No one chose (f)50-59%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%. For preservice Resource room teachers, the descriptive analysis indicated that 22 percent of these preservice Resource room teachers thought special education in Resource rooms spend (c)20-29% of the day on paperwork; 22 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; another 22 percent thought (e)40-49% of the day; 22 percent said (f)50-59% of the day; and 11 percent said (i)80-89% of the day. None of these preservice Resource room teachers chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%.

In question three, inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend doing non-academic activities(such as hall duty, bus duty, or lunch duty)?". Overall descriptive results showed that 51.7 percent of these inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent on non-academic activities; 27.5 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 6.8 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 10 percent indicated (d)30-39% of the day; and 3 percent chose (f)50-59% of the day. No one chose (e)40-49%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%. Preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education spends doing non-academic activities(such as hall duty, bus duty, or lunch duty)?". Overall



descriptive results showed that 51.7 percent of these inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent on non-academic activities; 27.5 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 6.8 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 10 percent indicated (d)30-39% of the day; and 3 percent chose (f)50-59% of the day. No one chose (e)40-49%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%. Preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education spends doing non-academic activities(such as hall duty, bus duty, or lunch duty)?". Overall descriptive results showed that 15 percent thought a special education teacher spends (a)0-9% of the day doing non-academic activities; 30 percent thought (b)10-19% of the day; 35 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; 15 percent said it was (d)30-39% of the day; and 5 percent said (f)50-59% of the day. None of them chose (e)40-49%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive results for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the third question in Section II showed that 25 percent of these inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent doing non-academic activities; 41.6 percent indicated (b)10-19% of the day; 16.6 percent said it was (c)20-29% of the day; 8 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; and another 8 percent said (f)50-59% of the day. No one chose (e)40-49%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%. For preservice self-contained classroom teachers, descriptive results showed that 18 percent thought a special education teacher in a self-contained classroom spends (a)0-9% of the day doing non-academic activities; 36 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 27 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; 9 percent chose (d)30-39% of the day; and 9 percent said it was (f)50-59% of the day. None of these preservice teachers chose (e)40-49%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%.



Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers on question three in Section II indicated that 70.5 percent of these inservice teachers said that they spend (a)0-9% of the day doing non-academic activities; 17.6 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; and 11.7 percent said (d)30-39% of the day. No one chose (c)20-29% or (e)40-49% through (j)90-100%. For preservice Resource room teachers, the descriptive results showed that 11 percent of these preservice teachers thought special education teachers in Resource rooms spend (a)0-9% of the day doing Non-academic activities; 22 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 44 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; and 22 percent said (d)30-39% of the day. None of these preservice Resource room teachers chose (e)40-49% through (j)90-100%.

In question four, inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY are the students for whom you are responsible in your classroom?". Overall descriptive results showed that 13.7 percent of these inservice teachers said (b)10-19% of the day; 6.8 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 3 percent indicated (h)70-79% of the day; 41 percent said (i)80-89% of the day; and 27.5 percent said (j)90-100% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, or (g)60-69%. Preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher's students for whom he/she are responsible, is in his/her classroom?". Overall descriptive results showed that 5 percent chose (b)10-19% of the day; 10 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 15 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; 5 percent chose (e)40-49% of the day; another 5 percent said (f)50-59% of the day; 15 percent said (g)60-69% of the day; 30 percent thought it was (h)70-79% of the day; and 15 percent chose (i)80-89% of the day. (A)0-9% and (j)90-100% were not chosen as responses.

For inservice self-contained classroom teachers on question four in Section II, descriptive analysis indicated that 8 percent of these inservice teachers said (f)50-59% of the day the students who they are responsible for are in their classroom; 8 percent said (h)70-79% of the day; 41.6 percent indicated (i)80-89% of the day; and another 41.6 percent said (j)90-100% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9% through (e)40-49% or (g)60-69%. Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 9 percent thought (c)20-29% of the day; 27 percent said (g)60-69% of the day; 36 percent said (h)70-79% of the day; and 27 percent chose (i)80-89% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, (f)50-59% or (j)90-100%.

For inservice Resource room teachers on question four in Section II, descriptive analysis indicated that 23.5 percent of these inservice teachers said (b)10-19% of the day the students who they are responsible for are in their classrooms; 11.7 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 5.8 percent indicated (f)50-59% of the day; 41 percent said (i)80-89% of the day; and 17.6 percent said (j)90-100% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, (g)60-69%, or (h)70-79%. Descriptive results for preservice Resource room teachers showed that 11 percent chose (b)10-19% of the day; another 11 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; 33 percent chose (d)30-39% of the day; 11 percent said (e)40-49% of the day; 11 percent said (f)50-59% of the day; and 22 percent said (h)70-79% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (g)60-69%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%.

For question five, inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend in actual teaching?". Overall descriptive results showed that 3 percent of the inservice teachers said that they spend (c)20-29% of the day in actual teaching; 6.8 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; 3 percent indicated (e)40-49% of the day; another 3 percent said (f)50-59% of the day; 13.7 percent said (g)60-69% of the day;

24 percent indicated (h)70-79% of the day; 34 percent said (i)80-89% of the day; and 10 percent said (j)90-100% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9% or (b)10-19%. Preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends in actual teaching?". Overall descriptive results showed that 10 percent felt that a special education teacher spends (c)20-29% of the day in actual teaching; another 10 percent said (d)30-39% of the day; 25 percent indicated (e)40-49% of the day; 40 percent chose (f)50-59% of the day; 10 percent said (g)60-69% of the day; and 5 percent chose (i)80-89% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive results for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on question five in Section II showed that 16.6 percent of these inservice teachers said that (d)30-39% of the day was spent in actual teaching; 8 percent said (f)50-59% of the day; 16.6 percent said (g)60-69% of the day; 41.6 percent indicated (h)70-79% of the day; 8 percent said (i)80-89% of the day; and another 8 percent said (j)90-100% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (c)20-29%, or (e)40-49%. For preservice self-contained classroom teachers, descriptive analysis indicated that 9 percent of these preservice teachers thought that special education teachers in self-contained classrooms spent (d)30-39% of the day in actual teaching; 18 percent said (e)40-49% of the day; 54.5 percent said (f)50-59% of the day; 9 percent indicated (g)60-69% of the day; and another 9 percent thought it was (i)80-89% of the day. None of these preservice teachers chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (c)20-29%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive results for inservice Resource room teachers on question five in Section II showed that 5.8 percent of these inservice teachers said that (c)20-29% was spent in actual teaching; 5.8 said (e)40-49% of the day; 11.7 percent indicated (g)60-69% of the day; another 11.7 percent chose (h)70-79% of the day; 52.9 percent said (i)80-89% of the day; and

11.7 percent said (j)90-100% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (d)30-39%, or (f)50-59%. For preservice Resource room teachers, descriptive analysis indicated that 22 percent said that they thought special education teachers in Resource rooms spent (c)20-29% of the day in actual teaching; 11 percent chose (d)30-39% of the day; 33 percent said (e)40-49% of the day; 22 percent indicated (f)50-59% of the day; and 11 percent chose (g)60-69% of the day. No one chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89% or (j)90-100%.

In question six, the inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend working with Regular teachers or other school personnel?". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 53.5 percent of the inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent with Regular teachers or other school personnel; 25 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 14 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 3.5 percent indicated (d)30-39% of the day; and another 3.5 percent said (i)80-89% of the day. No one chose (e)40-49%, (f)50-59%, (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%. Preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends working with regular teachers or other personnel?". Overall descriptive results showed that 25 percent felt that special education teachers spend (a)0-9% of the day with regular teachers or other school personnel; 40 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 20 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 5 percent said (e)40-49% of the day; and 10 percent said (f)50-59% of the day. None of these preservice teachers chose (d)30-39% or (g)60-69% through (j)90-100%.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on question six in Section II indicated that 66.6 percent of these inservice teachers said (a)0-9% of the day was spent with Regular teachers or other school personnel; 16.6 percent indicated (b)10-19% of the day;

and another 16.6 percent chose (c)20-29% of the day. No one chose (d)30-39% through (j)90-100%. For preservice self-contained classroom teachers, the descriptive results showed that 27 percent felt that special education teachers in self-contained classrooms spend (a)0-9% of the day working with Regular teachers or other school personnel; 36 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 18 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 9 percent said (e)40-49% of the day; and another 9 percent indicated (f)50-59% of the day. No one chose (d)30-39% or (g)60-69% through (j)90-100%.

On question six in Section II, descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers indicated that 43.9 percent of these inservice teachers said that (a)0-9% of the day was spent working with Regular teachers or other school personnel; 31 percent indicated (b)10-19% of the day; 12.5 percent said (c)20-29% of the day; 6 percent chose (d)30-39% of the day; and another 6 percent said (i)80-89% of the day. No one chose (e)40-49% through (h)70-79% or (j)90-100%. Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 22 percent of these preservice teachers thought special education teachers in Resource rooms spend (a)0-9% of the day working with Regular teachers or other school personnel; 44 percent said (b)10-19% of the day; 22 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the day; and 11 percent said (f)50-59% of the day. No one chose (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, or (g)60-69% through (j)90-100%.

For question seven, inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL WEEK do you spend in assessing and diagnosing students?". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 29.6 percent of the inservice teachers said that (a)0-9% of the week was spent assessing and diagnosing students; 11 percent indicated (b)10-19% of the week; 18.5 percent said (c)20-29% of the week; 11 percent said (d)30-39% of the week;



another 11 percent said (e)40-49% of the week; 7 percent indicated (f)50-59% of the week; 3.7 percent chose (g)60-69% of the week; 3.7 percent said (i)80-89% of the week; and another 3.7 percent chose (j)90-100% of the week. No one chose (h)70-79% as an answer. Preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL WEEK do you think a special education teacher spends in assessing and diagnosing his/her students?". Overall descriptive results showed that 10 percent of the preservice teachers said that (b)10-19% of the week a special education teacher spends assessing and diagnosing his/her students; 25 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the week; 15 percent said (d)30-39% of the week; 10 percent chose (e)40-49% of the week; 20 percent said (f)50-59% of the week; 10 percent chose (g)60-69% of the week; 5 percent indicated (h)70-79% of the week; and another 5 percent said (i)80-89% of the week. None of these preservice teachers chose (a)0-9% or (j)90-100% as answers.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on question seven in Section II, indicated that 16.6 percent of these inservice teachers said that (a)0-9% of the week was spent assessing and diagnosing students; 8 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; 25 percent chose (c)20-29% of the week; 8 percent indicated (d)30-39% of the week; 25 percent said (e)40-49% of the week; 8 percent said (f)50-59% of the week; and another 8 percent indicated (i)80-89% of the week. No one chose (g)60-69%, (h)70-79%, or (j)90-100%. Descriptive results for preservice self-contained classroom teachers showed that 18 percent of these preservice teachers said that (b)10-19% of the week a special education teacher in a self-contained classroom spends assessing and diagnosing his/her students; 27 percent chose (c)20-29% of the week; 9 indicated (d)30-39% of the week; another 9 percent said (e)40-49% of the week; 18 percent chose (f)50-59% of the week; and 9 percent said (g)60-69% of the week. No one chose (a)0-9%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive results for inservice Resource room teachers on question seven in Section II showed that 40 percent of these inservice teachers said that (a)0-9 percent of the week was spent on assessing and diagnosing students; 13 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; another 13 percent said (c)20-29% of the week; 13 percent chose (d)30-39% of the week; 6.6 percent said (f)50-59% of the week; 6.6 percent said (g)60-69% of the week; and another 6.6 percent said (j)90-100% of the week. No one chose (e)40-49%, (h)70-79%, or (i)80-89%. For preservice Resource room teachers, the descriptive analysis indicated that 22 percent of these preservice teachers thought special education teachers in Resource rooms spend (c)20-29% of the week assessing and diagnosing students; 22 percent chose (d)30-39% of the week; 11 percent said (e)40-49% of the week; 22 percent indicated (f)50-59% of the week; 11 percent chose (h)70-79% of the week; and another 11 percent said (i)80-89% of the week. No one chose (a)0-9%, (b)10-19%, (g)60-69%, or (j)90-100%.

Finally, in question eight, inservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL WEEK do you spend in consultation with your students' parents?". Overall descriptive results showed that 57 percent of these inservice teachers said that they spend (a)0-9% of the week in consultation with their students' parents; 17.8 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; 14 percent indicated (c)20-29% of the week; 3.5 percent indicated (f)50-59% of the week; 3.5 percent chose (g)60-69% of the week; and another 3.5 percent said (h)70-79% of the week. No one chose (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%. The preservice teachers were asked: "On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL WEEK do you think a special education teacher spends in consultation with his/her students' parents?". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 30



percent of these preservice teachers thought that special education teachers spend (a)0-9% of the week in consultation with their students' parents; another 30 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; 15 percent chose (c)20-29% of the week; another 15 percent said (d)30-39% of the week; and 10 percent indicated (e)40-49% of the week. No one chose (f)50-59% through (j)90-100%.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on question eight in Section II indicated that 50 percent of these inservice teachers said that they spend (a)0-9% of the week in consultation with their students' parents; 16.6 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; another 16.6 percent said (c)20-29% of the week; 8 percent chose (f)50-59% of the week; and another 8 percent said (g)60-69% of the week. No one chose (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, (h)70-79%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%.

Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 18 percent of these preservice teachers thought that special education teachers in self-contained classrooms spend (a)0-9% of the week in consultation with their students' parents; 36 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; 18 percent chose (c)20-29% of the week; another 18 percent indicated (d)30-39% of the week; and 9 percent thought it was (e)40-49% of the week. No one chose (f)50-59% through (j)90-100%.

Descriptive results for inservice Resource room teachers on question eight in Section II showed that 62.5 percent of these inservice teachers said that (a)0-9% of the week was spent in consultation with their students' parents; 18.7 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; 12.5 percent said (c)20-29% of the week; and six percent chose (h)70-79% of the week. No one chose (d)30-39%, (e)40-49%, (f)50-59%, (g)60-69%, (i)80-89%, or (j)90-100%. For preservice Resource room teachers, descriptive analysis indicated that 44 percent of these preservice teachers thought that

special education teachers in Resource rooms spend (a)0-9% of the week in consultation with their students parents; 22 percent said (b)10-19% of the week; 11 percent chose (c)20-29% of the week; 11 percent said (d)30-39% of the week; and another 11 percent chose (e)40-49% of the week. No one chose (f)50-59% through (j)90-100%.

## RESULTS FOR SECTION III

## INTRODUCTION

This section contains the descriptive and inferential analysis for Section III of the questionnaires, which compares the results of all the inservice teachers with those of all the preservice teachers (students). Comparisons will also be made of the results between inservice self-contained classroom teachers and students who wanted to work in self-contained classrooms (The researcher will refer to these students as preservice self-contained classroom teachers). These same comparisons will be made of the results between Resource room teachers and students who wanted to work in Resource rooms (The researcher will refer to these students as preservice Resource room teachers). Chi-square analysis was used to analyze the responses in this part. In order to use Chi-square, "Strongly Agree(1)" and "Agree(2)" were collapsed to become one category, "Undecided(3)" stayed a category, and "Disagree(4)" and "Strongly Disagree(5)" were collapsed to become one category. In some cases, the results reported in this section should be considered with caution, especially when interpreting results that show a significant relationship. Even with collapsing the cells, some resulted in expected frequencies of less than five and because of this there is a chance that the results are exaggerated. The preservice and inservice teachers were asked to rate the given statements along a continuum of Strongly Agree(1) to Strongly Disagree(5). The actual numbers of the specific answers chosen for each question are contained in Tables A-X in Appendix C.

## SECTION III RESULTS

For the inservice teachers, the first statement was, "Special education teachers are given the recognition they deserve". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 6.8 percent of the inservice teachers

strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 20.6 percent agreed(2); 17.2 percent were undecided(3); 37.9 percent disagreed(4); and 17.2 percent strongly disagreed(5). The first statement for the preservice teachers was the same as the inservice teachers' first statement. Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 5 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 10 percent agreed(2); 15 percent were undecided(3); 45 percent disagreed(4); and 25 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of this first statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=1.29;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice teachers did not disagree on their perception of this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers for the first statement in Section III indicated that 8 percent of the inservice self-contained classroom teachers strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 25 percent agreed(2); 8 percent were undecided(3); 33 percent disagreed(4); and 25 percent strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 9 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 27 percent were undecided(3); 54.5 percent disagreed(4); and 9 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Agree(2)" as an answer. Inferential analysis indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=2.81;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers did not disagree on their perception of this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers for the first statement in Section III indicated that 5.8 percent of the inservice Resource Room teachers strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 17.6 percent agreed(2); 23.5 percent were undecided(3); 41 percent disagreed(4); and 11.7 percent strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 22 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 33 percent disagreed(4); and 44 percent strongly disagreed(5).

No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)" or "Undecided(3)" as answers.

Inferential analysis indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=2.15;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice Resource room teachers did not disagree on their perception of this first statement.

The second statement for the inservice teachers was, "I have an adequate understanding of my role as a Special Educator". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 68.9 percent strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 27.5 percent agreed(2); 3 percent were undecided(3); and no one disagreed(4) or strongly disagreed(5) with this statement. The preservice teachers' statement was, "I have an adequate understanding of what my role will be as a Special Educator". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 25 percent strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 55 percent agreed(2); 15 percent were undecided(3); and 5 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Disagree(4)" as an answer. Inferential analysis of the second statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=3.92;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice teachers did not disagree on their perception of this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers for the second statement in Section III indicated that 83 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 8 percent agreed(2); and 8 percent were undecided(3). No one chose "Disagree(4)" or "Strongly Disagree(5)" as answers. Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 18 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 63.6 percent agreed(2); and 18 percent were undecided(3). No one chose "Disagree(4)" or "Strongly Disagree(5)". Inferential analysis of the second statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=.55;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers did not disagree on their perceptions of this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers for the second statement in Section III indicated that 58.8 percent of the inservice Resource room teachers strongly agreed(1) with the statement and 41 percent agreed(2). No one chose "Undecided(3)", "Disagree(4)", or "Strongly Disagree(5)" as answers. Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 33 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 44 percent agreed(2); 11 percent were undecided(3); and 11 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Disagree(4)" as an answer. Inferential analysis of the second statement indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=4.07;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice Resource room teachers did not disagree on their perception of the statement.

The third statement for the inservice teachers was, "Generally, I am not satisfied with my students' progress". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 3 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 17.2 percent agreed(2); 10 percent were undecided(3); 48 percent disagreed(4); and 20.6 percent strongly disagreed(5). Statement three for preservice teachers was, "Generally, special education teachers are not satisfied with their students' progress". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 5 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 10 percent agreed(2); 25 percent were undecided(3); 50 percent disagreed(4); and 10 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the third statement indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=1.87;n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of preservice and inservice teachers on this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the third statement in Section III indicated that 8 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 8 percent were undecided(3); 66.6 percent disagreed(4); and 16.6 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Agree(2)" as an answer. Descriptive analysis for preservice self-



contained classroom teachers indicated that 27 percent were undecided(3) and 72.7 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)", "Agree(2)", or "Strongly Disagree(5) as answers. Inferential analysis of the third statement indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=2.29;n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers did not disagree on their perception of this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice resource room teachers on the third statement in Section III indicated that 29 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 11.7 percent were undecided(3); 35 percent disagreed(4); and 23.5 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)" as an answer. Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 11 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 22 percent agreed(2); 22 percent were undecided(3); 22 percent disagreed(4); and 22 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the third statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=.620;n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of inservice and preservice Resource room teachers on this statement.

For the inservice teachers, the fourth statement was, "There is limited interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel at my school". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 25 percent agreed(2) with this statement; 7 percent were undecided(3); 39 percent disagreed(4); and 28.5 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree" as an answer. For the preservice teachers, the fourth statement was, "There is limited interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel in the schools". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 20 percent of the preservice teachers strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 30 percent agreed(2); 30 percent



were undecided(3); and 20 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Disagree(5)" as an answer. Inferential analysis of the data indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=11.40; p<.01$ ) that there was a difference between the way inservice and preservice teachers responded to the statements. Preservice teachers agreed that there is a limited interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel, but inservice teachers disagreed that there is limited interaction.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the fourth statement in section III indicated that 9 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 9 percent were undecided(3); 36 percent disagreed(4); and 45 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree" as an answer. Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 9 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 36 percent agreed(2); 18 percent were undecided(3); 36 percent disagreed(4); and no one strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the fourth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=4.92; n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers on the fourth statement.

Descriptive analysis for the inservice Resource room teachers on the fourth statement in Section III indicated that 35 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 5.8 were undecided(3); 41 percent disagreed(4); and 17.6 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree" as an answer. Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 33 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 22 percent agreed(2); 44 percent were undecided(3); and no one disagreed(4) or strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the fourth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=10.68; p<.01$ ) that there was a difference between the way inservice and preservice Resource room teachers responded to the statement. Inservice Resource room teachers disagreed that there is limited

interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel, preservice Resource room teachers agreed or were undecided that there is a limited interaction.

The fifth statement for inservice teachers was, "The majority of the time in my class, I am able to set up a schedule for activities and follow it". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 37.9 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 51.7 percent agreed(2); 3 percent were undecided(3); and 6.8 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Agree(5)" as an answer. The fifth statement for preservice teachers was, "The majority of the time, a special education teacher is able to set up a schedule for activities and follow it". Overall descriptive indicated that 40 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 25 percent were undecided(3); 20 percent disagreed(4); and 15 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)". Inferential analysis of the data indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=13.93; p<.01$ ) that there was a difference in the way preservice and inservice teachers responded to this statement. Inservice teachers indicated that they could set up a schedule and follow it, whereas the preservice teachers indicated that they thought a special education teacher could not set up a schedule and follow it. Also, more preservice teachers than expected were undecided about this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the fifth statement in Section III indicated that 41.6 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 41.6 percent agreed(2); and 16.6 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Undecided(3)" or "Strongly Disagree(5)" as answers. Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 54.5 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 18 percent were undecided(3); another 18 percent disagreed(4); and 9 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)" as an answer.

Inferential analysis for the fifth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=3.01; n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers on the fifth statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers on the fifth question in Section III indicated that 35 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 58.8 percent agreed; 5.8 percent were undecided(3) and no one disagreed(4) or strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 22 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 33 percent were undecided(3); 22 percent disagreed(4); and another 22 percent strongly disagreed(5). No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)" as an answer. Inferential analysis on the fifth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=14.58; p<.01$ ) that there was a difference in the way inservice and preservice Resource room teachers responded to this statement. Inservice Resource room teachers indicated that they could set up a schedule and follow it, whereas the preservice Resource room teachers indicated that they thought special education teachers could not set up a schedule and follow it.

The sixth statement for inservice teachers was, "Administrators, Regular classroom teachers, students, and students' parents support my professional efforts". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 13.7 percent strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 62 percent agreed(2); 17 percent were undecided(3); and 6.8 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Disagreed(5)" as an answer. The sixth statement for preservice teachers was, "Administrators, Regular classroom teachers, students, and students' parents support the special education teachers' efforts". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 10 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 15 percent agreed(2); 25 percent were undecided(3); 45 percent disagreed(4); and 5 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential

analysis of the data indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=14.83; p<.01$ ) that there was a difference in the way preservice and inservice teachers responded to this statement. Inservice teachers agreed that their professional efforts are supported, whereas preservice teachers disagreed that the special education teacher's professional efforts are supported.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the sixth statement indicated that 16.6 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 66.6 percent agreed(2); 16.6 percent were undecided and no one disagreed(4) or strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 18 percent agreed(2) with the statement; 27 percent were undecided; and 54.5 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Agree(1)" or "Strongly Disagree(5)" as answers. Inferential analysis for the sixth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=11.28; p<.01$ ) that there was a difference in the way inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers responded to this statement. Inservice self-contained classroom teachers agreed that their professional efforts are supported, whereas preservice self-contained classroom teachers disagreed that the special education teacher's professional efforts are supported.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers on the sixth statement in Section III indicated that 11.7 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 58.8 percent agreed(2); 17.6 percent were undecided(3); 11.7 percent disagreed(4); and no one strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 22 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 11 percent agreed(2); 22 percent were undecided(3); 33 percent disagreed(4); and 11 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis for the sixth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=4.15; n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of inservice and preservice Resource room teachers with this

statement.

For inservice teachers, the seventh statement was, "It is difficult to keep up with all new rules, policies, and procedures in teaching exceptional children". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 6.8 percent of the inservice teachers strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 44.8 percent agreed(2); ten percent were undecided(3); 27.5 percent disagreed(4); and 10 percent strongly disagreed(5). The seventh statement for the preservice teachers was the same as the inservice teachers' seventh statement. Overall descriptive analysis of the data indicated that 15 percent of the preservice teachers strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 50 percent agreed(2); 20 percent were undecided(3); 10 percent disagreed(4); and 5 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the data indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=3.40;n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of preservice and inservice teachers with this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the seventh statement in Section III indicated that 8 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 50 percent agreed(2); 8 percent were undecided(3); 25 percent disagreed(4); and 8 percent strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that nine percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 45 percent agreed(2); 27 percent were undecided(3); 9 percent disagreed(4); and another 9 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis for the seventh statement indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=1.77;n.s.$ ) that there was no difference in the way inservice and preservice self-contained classroom teachers responded to the statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers on the seventh statement in Section III indicated that 5.8 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 41 percent agreed(2); 11.7 percent were

undecided(3); 29 percent disagreed(4); and 11.7 percent strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 22 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 55.5 percent agreed(2); 11 percent were undecided(3); 11 percent disagreed(4); and no one strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the data for the seventh statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(2)}=2.73; n.s.$ ) that inservice and preservice Resource room teachers did not disagree on their perceptions of the statement.

The eighth statement for inservice teachers was, "I spend very little time away from my students during school hours". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 51.7 percent of these inservice teachers strongly agreed(1) with this statement; 34 percent agreed(2); 3 percent were undecided(3); and 10 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Disagree(5)" as an answer. The eighth statement for preservice teachers was, "A special education teacher spends very little time away from his/her students during school hours". Overall descriptive analysis indicated that 20 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 40 percent agreed(2); 25 percent were undecided(3); 10 percent disagreed(4); and 5 percent strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis on the eighth statement indicated ( $\chi^2_{(3)}=6.02; p<.05$ ) that there was a difference between the way preservice and inservice teachers responded to this statement. Inservice teachers agreed that they spend very little time away from their students, whereas preservice teachers (more that expected) were undecided about this statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice self-contained classroom teachers on the eighth statement in Section III indicated that 66.6 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 25 percent agreed(2); and 8 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Undecided(3)" or "Strongly Disagree(5)" as

answers. Descriptive analysis for preservice self-contained classroom teachers indicated that 27 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 36 percent agreed(2); 18 percent were undecided(3); 18 percent disagreed(4); and no one strongly disagreed(5). Inferential analysis of the eighth statement indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=3.05;n.s$ ) that inservice and preservice teachers did not disagree on their perceptions of the statement.

Descriptive analysis for inservice Resource room teachers on the eighth statement in Section III indicated that 41 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; another 41 percent agreed(2); 5.8 percent were undecided(3); 11.7 percent disagreed(4); and no one strongly disagreed(5). Descriptive analysis for preservice Resource room teachers indicated that 11 percent strongly agreed(1) with the statement; 44 percent agreed(2); 33 percent were undecided(3); and 11 percent disagreed(4). No one chose "Strongly Disagree(5)" as an answer. Inferential analysis of the eighth statement indicated( $\chi^2_{(2)}=3.41;n.s.$ ) that there was no difference between the perceptions of preservice and inservice Resource room teachers with this statement.



## SUMMARY

Chapter four detailed the results of the study through both descriptive and inferential analyses. Descriptive analysis of Section II revealed discrepancies in the percentages of inservice and preservice teachers on questions dealing with plans to remain in the classroom, paperwork, responsibility of the students, and the amount of time spent in actual teaching. Inferential analyses on Section III indicated significant differences in statements dealing with interaction of school personnel, ability to set up schedules, support from administrators, Regular teachers, students, and students' parents, and the amount of time spent away from students. Chapter five will be a discussion of these results.

CHAPTER 5

## DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

## Introduction

As indicated in Chapter four, descriptive and inferential analyses showed significant differences in the responses made by inservice and preservice teachers on some questions and statements. This chapter includes the discussion of these results.

## Discussion of Results in Section II

Descriptive analysis on Section II for all the inservice and preservice teachers showed definite differences in responses made by the two groups on two questions. ( A definite difference was defined by the researcher as more than twenty percentage points(e.g. two percentage groupings) between the answer of the two groups which received the most responses. The researcher used this term to acknowledge a difference(not necessarily significant) between the inservice teachers and the preservice teachers.) Question two and Question five showed definite differences in the responses by the two groups.

Question two dealt with the percentage of time spent on paperwork per school day. Inservice teachers gave the lowest percentage possible(0-9%), whereas the preservice teachers gave a medium percentage(30-39%). Perhaps this difference is related to the time of the school year(at the end) in which the questionnaires were administered to the two groups. If the questionnaires had been given at the beginning of a school year, the inservice teachers responses may have been higher because special education teachers have to write I.E.P.s at the beginning of the year for new students. One inservice teacher put on his/her questionnaire that it "comes in cycles". Or perhaps, the low percentage given by the inservice teachers may possibly be related to the fact many inservice teachers do

their paperwork at home after school. Some inservice teachers do very little paperwork during the school day. Also, for preservice teachers, the higher percentage could be attributed to the necessary emphasis of required paperwork.

Question five dealt with the percentage of time spent in actual teaching. The inservice teachers gave a high percentage(80-89%), but the preservice teachers gave a medium percentage(50-59%). Perhaps preservice teachers took into consideration a larger amount of time spent on paperwork and non-academic activities than the amount inservice teachers took into consideration(since preservice teachers did give a higher percentage on paperwork and non-academic activities than inservice teachers). Also, the difference could be related to the possibility that some of the preservice teachers did not realize the amount of time a special education teacher spends in actual teaching.

Descriptive analysis on Section II for Resource room inservice and preservice teachers revealed definite differences in responses made by these two groups. Question one, Question four and Question five showed definite differences in the responses by the two groups. Inferential analysis was conducted on Question one.

Question one dealt with inservice and preservice teachers' plans to stay in the classroom. Inservice Resource room teachers planned to stay in the classroom but preservice Resource room teachers were undecided about remaining in the classroom once teaching. Inferential analysis also indicated a significant difference between the responses of the two groups. This difference may be due to the uncertainty of some college students about their futures.

Question four dealt with the percentage of a school day a special education teacher's students who he/she is responsible for are in his/her

class. Inservice Resource room teachers gave a high percentage(80-89%), but preservice Resource room teachers gave a low-medium percentage(30-39%). Perhaps this difference is related to the definition of a Resource room given to preservice teachers. Preservice teachers are informed that in a Resource room a student spends less than fifty percent of his/her school day. Or perhaps, the inservice Resource room teachers perceived the question differently. They may have considered the percentage of time for all their students together instead of the percentage of time for the students individually.

Question five's descriptive results for preservice and inservice Resource room teachers were very similar to the descriptive results for all preservice and inservice teachers. The reasons for this relationship between the two groups of Resource room teachers are probably similar to the reasons for the relationship between the two overall groups.

Descriptive analysis on Section II for self-contained inservice and preservice teachers showed no definite differences in the responses made by the two groups. Inferential analysis on question one also did not reveal any significant differences.

After analyzing all these results, the researcher believes that preservice teachers at Pembroke State University are aware of the job responsibilities that will be expected of them(especially the preservice self-contained classroom teachers). When reviewing the results, the researcher expected to find that preservice teachers gave lower percentages on the questions than inservice teachers. Instead, the researcher found higher percentages given by the preservice teachers. If a lower percentage had been found then it would have proven the researcher's hypothesis. A lower percentage given by the preservice teachers than inservice teachers may have demonstrated that the preservice

teachers in this study had unrealistic expectations of what their jobs will be once teaching.

### Discussion of the Results in Section III

In Section III, inferential analysis was used to compare the responses of the two groups. Inferential analysis on Section III for all inservice and preservice teachers showed significant differences in responses made by the two groups on four Statements. Statement four, Statement five, Statement six, and Statement eight all showed significant differences in the responses by the two groups.

Statement four dealt with limited interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel. Inservice teachers disagreed that there is limited interaction but preservice teachers agreed that there is limited interaction. However, in Section II, Question six, the two groups were asked to give a percentage of a school day spent working with Regular teachers and other school personnel, the majority of the inservice teachers said 0-9% of the school day was spent with Regular teachers and other school personnel. The majority of preservice teachers said it was 10-19% of a school day. Therefore, inservice teachers gave a lower percentage than preservice teachers on this question. This seems to be a contradiction to the responses made by inservice teachers on the fourth statement in Section III. Perhaps inservice teachers view this as an adequate amount of time during the day to interact with other school personnel but to preservice teachers it is a limited amount of time to interact with other school personnel. Or perhaps, this difference may possibly be related to the fact that some preservice teachers believe that special education teachers are isolated from other school personnel.

There is sufficient documented evidence in the literature on this isolation factor.

Resource room inservice and preservice teachers also differed on their responses of the fourth statement, just as results showed differences for all the inservice and preservice teachers. (It is difficult and unwarranted for the researcher to draw conclusions relating to the significant differences found in the Resource groups and the Self-Contained groups in Section III. Thus, the researcher only noted the significant differences between these groups and did not formulate any explanations for them.)

Statement five dealt with the ability to set up a schedule for activities and follow it. Inservice teachers agreed that they were able to set up a schedule and follow it. Preservice teachers, though, disagreed with this statement and some were undecided. They did not think a special education teacher could set up a schedule and follow it. Perhaps, inservice teachers did not take into account the times it takes to review a lesson previously taught. Whereas, preservice teachers are reminded that for special education students lessons sometimes have to be reviewed longer than planned and they took this into consideration when responding to this statement.

Resource room inservice and preservice teachers also differed on their responses for Statement five, just as results showed differences for all inservice and preservice teachers.

Statement six dealt with the professional support a special education teacher receives from others. Inservice teachers agreed that



administrators, regular teachers, students, and student's parents supported their professional efforts. Preservice teachers disagreed. Studies (Lawrenson and McKinnon, 1980; Weiskopf, 1980) reviewed by the researcher also support the preservice teachers' view or perceptions. A large majority of the literature suggests that special education teachers lack support from others. Perhaps the inservice teachers are in a school system which supports them and their efforts as professionals.

Self-Contained inservice and preservice teachers also differed on their responses for this sixth Statement, just as results showed differences for all the inservice and preservice teachers.

Statement eight dealt with the time a special education teacher spends away from his/her students during school hours. Inservice teachers agreed that they spend very little time away from their students. Preservice teachers were undecided. Perhaps preservice teachers did not feel familiar enough with the amount of time a special education teacher spends with his/her students to either agree or disagree.

The results found in Section III contradicted the information found in the majority of the literature (except Statement eight). The results for Statement eight confirmed what the literature indicated. As revealed in the literature, these special education inservice teachers were in constant contact with their students during the school day. But overall, these inservice teachers responded the way the preservice teachers were expected to respond and vice versa. But this is good for preservice teachers because it leads one to believe that preservice teachers realize some of the pressures and hassles of being a special education teacher.

After reviewing these results, there seems to be less a difference between students going into self-contained classrooms and self-contained classroom teachers than students going into Resource rooms and Resource

room teachers. It also appears that Pembroke State University's undergraduate program for Special Education is preparing students for their jobs, especially students who want to go into self-contained classrooms.

Although the researcher's hypothesis was proven to be false in this study, one cannot assume that preservice teachers from Pembroke State University will not become burned-out. Even though these preservice teachers put on paper fairly accurate percentages of time spent on activities and seemed to be aware of the different sources(e.g. limited interaction, constant contact with students, professional support, etc.) that might cause burnout, it does not mean that these preservice teachers will be able to handle the amount of work necessary to carry-out their job responsibilities or to handle the sources that cause burnout. It is one thing to say (or write down) something, but it is an entirely different situation to actually do it.

#### Limitations

The biggest limitation of this study was that the researcher was unable to make more comparisons between inservice and preservice teachers. Answers in the demographic categories did not correspond between the two groups. For example, in the category of type of students, inservice teachers taught a combination of classes of Learning Disabilities(LD), Educable Mentally Handicapped(EMH), and Academically Gifted all together. The preservice teachers, though, put down only one type of student they want to teach like LD or EMH. Very few chose combinations of type of students like the inservice teachers did. Other limitations included: 1) the questionnaires were developed by the researcher and therefore were not standardized instruments; 2) the study was conducted in a limited

geographic area; and 3) the sample size was too small for more extensive generalizations.

#### Future Research

If the researcher were to replicate this study, she would make the following changes: 1) Have some special education teachers give input on the different categories given on the demographic data sheet and 2) Use a larger sample of each group. Also, further research is definitely needed in the area of burnout in general and in special education. The prevalence of teacher burnout, the effects of a burned out teacher on his/her students, and ways to prevent burnout are all areas which need to be examined before burnout can be truly understood.

#### Summary

Chapter five discussed the results of the study. Some significant differences were found between the responses made by the two groups. But it seems that the researcher's hypothesis was not proven and that may be these preservice teachers do know what is expected of them as special education teachers. This chapter also included possible explanations of the results.



Dear Teacher:

As part of the requirements of the Chancellor's Scholars Program at Pembroke State University, I am working on my senior thesis. I am attempting to compare the perceptions of Special Education inservice teachers with those of Special Education preservice teachers on selected factors. I would appreciate you completing the attached questionnaire and returning it to me. Thank-you for your help and cooperation.

Laura Callahan

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION I Background Information

Directions: Please answer the following questions as specifically as possible.

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: \_\_\_\_\_

Years in Teaching Special Education: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL Years in Teaching: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest DEGREE Held (i.e., B.A., B.S.; M.A., M.S.; Ph.D., Ed.D.; Ed.S.): \_\_\_\_\_  
in \_\_\_\_\_

GRADE LEVEL You Teach: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Special Education CLASS (e.g. Resource, Self-Contained): \_\_\_\_\_

Type(s) of STUDENTS (e.g. EMH, LD, TMH): \_\_\_\_\_

NUMBER of Students You Teach Per DAY: \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION II

Directions: Please answer the following by checking one response to each question.

1. Are you currently planning to remain in the classroom?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ Undecided \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

2. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend on paperwork (such as writing I.E.P.'s and completing the necessary forms)?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

3. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend doing non-academic activities (such as hall duty, bus duty, or lunch duty)?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

4. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY are the students for whom you are responsible in your classroom?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

5. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend in actual teaching?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%



6. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL DAY do you spend working with Regular classroom teachers or other school personnel?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

7. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL WEEK do you spend in assessing and diagnosing students?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

8. On the average, what percent of the SCHOOL WEEK do you spend in consultation with your students' parents?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
\_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
\_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
\_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
\_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
\_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
\_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
\_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
\_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

### SECTION III

Directions: Rate the following along a continuum of Strongly Agree(1) to Strongly Disagree(5). Circle one answer for each question.

1. Special Education teachers are given the recognition they deserve.

Strongly Agree                      Undecided                      Strongly Disagree  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. I have an adequate understanding of my role as a Special Educator.

Strongly Agree                      Undecided                      Strongly Disagree  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5

3. Generally, I am not satisfied with my students' progress.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

4. There is limited interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel at my school.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

5. The majority of the time in my class, I am able to set up a schedule for activities and follow it.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

6. Administrators, regular classroom teachers, students, and students' parents support my professional efforts.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

7. It is difficult to keep up with all new rules, policies, and procedures in teaching exceptional children.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

8. I spend very little time away from my students during school hours.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

Dear Student:

As part of the requirements of the Chancellor's Scholars Program, I am working on my senior thesis. I am attempting to compare the perceptions of Special Education inservice teachers with those of Special Education preservice teachers on selected factors. I would appreciate you completing the attached questionnaire and returning it to me. Thank-you for your help and cooperation.

Laura Callahan

# STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

## SECTION I Background Information

**Directions:** Please answer the following questions as specifically as possible.  
(Check the appropriate answer.)

**Age:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Sex:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PRESENT Classification:** Freshman \_\_\_\_\_ Senior \_\_\_\_\_  
Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate \_\_\_\_\_  
Junior \_\_\_\_\_ Back for Certification \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Special Education CLASS you desire to work in:** Resource \_\_\_\_\_  
Self-Contained \_\_\_\_\_

**GRADE Level(s) you desire to work in:** Primary (K-3) \_\_\_\_\_  
Intermediate (4-6) \_\_\_\_\_  
Middle Grades (7-9) \_\_\_\_\_  
Senior High (10-12) \_\_\_\_\_  
Other \_\_\_\_\_ (Please specify \_\_\_\_\_)

**Type(s) of STUDENTS you desire to work with:** EMH \_\_\_\_\_ LD \_\_\_\_\_  
TMH \_\_\_\_\_ EH \_\_\_\_\_  
S/PMH \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(Please specify \_\_\_\_\_)

## SECTION II

**Directions:** Please answer the following questions in relationship to the type of classroom you desire to work in (i.e., Resource or Self-Contained). Check only one answer per question.

1. Once teaching, do you plan to remain in the classroom?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

Undecided \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

2. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends on paperwork (such as writing I.E.P.'s and completing the necessary forms)?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
 \_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
 \_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
 \_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
 \_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
 \_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
 \_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
 \_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
 \_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

3. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends doing non-academic activities (such as hall duty, bus duty, or lunch duty)?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
 \_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
 \_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
 \_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
 \_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
 \_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
 \_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
 \_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
 \_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

4. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher's students for whom he/she is responsible, is in his/her classroom?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
 \_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
 \_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
 \_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
 \_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
 \_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
 \_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
 \_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
 \_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

5. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends in actual teaching?

\_\_\_\_ (a) 0-9%  
 \_\_\_\_ (b) 10-19%  
 \_\_\_\_ (c) 20-29%  
 \_\_\_\_ (d) 30-39%  
 \_\_\_\_ (e) 40-49%

\_\_\_\_ (f) 50-59%  
 \_\_\_\_ (g) 60-69%  
 \_\_\_\_ (h) 70-79%  
 \_\_\_\_ (i) 80-89%  
 \_\_\_\_ (j) 90-100%

6. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL DAY do you think a special education teacher spends working with Regular teachers and other school personnel?

☐ (a) 0-9%  
☐ (b) 10-19%  
☐ (c) 20-29%  
☐ (d) 30-39%  
☐ (e) 40-49%

☐ (f) 50-59%  
☐ (g) 60-69%  
☐ (h) 70-79%  
☐ (i) 80-89%  
☐ (j) 90-100%

7. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL WEEK do you think a special education teacher spends in assessing and diagnosing his/her students?

☐ (a) 0-9%  
☐ (b) 10-19%  
☐ (c) 20-29%  
☐ (d) 30-39%  
☐ (e) 40-49%

☐ (f) 50-59%  
☐ (g) 60-69%  
☐ (h) 70-79%  
☐ (i) 80-89%  
☐ (j) 90-100%

8. On the average, what percent of a SCHOOL WEEK do you think a special education teacher spends in consultation with his/her students' parents?

☐ (a) 0-9%  
☐ (b) 10-19%  
☐ (c) 20-29%  
☐ (d) 30-39%  
☐ (e) 40-49%

☐ (f) 50-59%  
☐ (g) 60-69%  
☐ (h) 70-79%  
☐ (i) 80-89%  
☐ (j) 90-100%

### SECTION III

Directions: Please rate the following questions in relationship to the type of classroom you desire to work in (i.e., Resource or Self-Contained) along a continuum of Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (5). Circle one answer for each question.

1. Special Education teachers are given the recognition they deserve.

Strongly Agree                      Undecided                      Strongly Disagree  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. I have an adequate understanding of what my role will be as a Special Educator.

Strongly Agree                      Undecided                      Strongly Disagree  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5

3. Generally, special education teachers are not satisfied with their students' progress.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

4. There is limited interaction between special education teachers and other school personnel in the schools.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

5. The majority of the time in the class, a special education teacher is able to set up a schedule for activities and follow it.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

6. Administrators, regular classroom teachers, students, and students' parents support the special education teachers' efforts.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

7. It is difficult to keep up with all new rules, policies, and procedures in teaching exceptional children.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

8. A special education teacher spends very little time away from his/her students during school hours.

Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5





## Section II

## Overall Results

Table A

	Y	N	U	Q-1
Teacher	26	1	2	
Student	12	2	6	

Table B

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-2
Teacher	9	7	5	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	
Student	1	1	4	6	4	2	0	0	2	0	

Table C

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-3
Teacher	15	8	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Student	3	6	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	

Table D

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-4
Teacher	0	4	2	0	0	2	0	1	12	8	
Student	0	1	2	3	1	1	3	6	3	0	

Table E

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-5
Teacher	0	0	1	2	1	1	4	7	10	3	
Student	0	0	2	2	5	8	2	0	1	0	

Table F

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-6
Teacher	15	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Student	5	8	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	

# Overall Results

Table G

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%
Teacher	8	3	5	3	3	2	1	0	1	1
Student	0	2	5	3	2	4	2	1	1	0

Q-7

Table H

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%
Teacher	16	5	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Student	6	6	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0

Q-8

## Section II

### Resource Results

Table I

	Y	N	U	Q-1
Teacher	14	2	1	
Student	5	0	4	

Table J

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-2
Teacher	6	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	
Student	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	

Table K

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-3
Teacher	12	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Student	1	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Table L

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-4
Teacher	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	3	
Student	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	2	0	0	

Table M

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-5
Teacher	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	9	2	
Student	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	

Table N

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-6
Teacher	7	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Student	2	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	

# Resource Results

Table O

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Teacher	6	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	1
Student	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	1	1	0

Q-7

Table P

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Teacher	10	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Student	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

Q-8

## Section II

### Self-Contained Results

Table Q

	Y	N	U	Q-1
Teacher	12	0	0	
Student	7	2	2	

Table R

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-2
Teacher	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	
Student	1	1	2	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	

Table S

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-3
Teacher	3	5	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Student	2	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	

Table T

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-4
Teacher	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	
Student	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	

Table U

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-5
Teacher	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	5	1	1	
Student	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	0	1	0	

Table V

	A 0-9%	B 10-19%	C 20-29%	D 30-39%	E 40-49%	F 50-59%	G 60-69%	H 70-79%	I 80-89%	J 90-100%	Q-6
Teacher	8	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Student	3	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	

# Self-Contained Results

Table W

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Teacher	2	1	3	1	3	1	0	0	1	0
Student	0	2	3	1	1	2	2	0	0	0

Q-7

Table X

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Teacher	6	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Student	2	4	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0

Q-8



APPENDIX C

Table 1

Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Population	100	105	110	115	120	125
Area	100	105	110	115	120	125

Table 2

Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Population	100	105	110	115	120	125
Area	100	105	110	115	120	125

Table 3

Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Population	100	105	110	115	120	125
Area	100	105	110	115	120	125

# APPENDIX C

Table 4

Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Population	100	105	110	115	120	125
Area	100	105	110	115	120	125

Table 5

Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Population	100	105	110	115	120	125
Area	100	105	110	115	120	125

Table 6

Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Population	100	105	110	115	120	125
Area	100	105	110	115	120	125

## Section III

## Overall Results

Table A

Q-1

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	2	6	5	11	5
Student	1	2	3	9	5

Table B

Q-2

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	20	8	1	0	0
Student	5	11	3	0	1

Table C

Q-3

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	1	5	3	14	6
Student	1	2	5	10	2

Table D

Q-4

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	0	7	2	11	8
Student	4	6	6	4	0

Table E

Q-5

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	11	15	1	2	0
Student	0	8	5	4	3

Table F

Q-6

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	4	18	5	2	0
Student	2	3	5	9	1

# Overall Results

Table G

Q-7

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	4	18	5	2	0
Student	2	3	5	9	1

Table H

Q-8

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	2	13	3	8	3
Student	3	10	4	2	1

## Key

1= Strongly Agree

2= Agree

3= Undecided

4= Disagree

5= Strongly Disagree

Section III

Resource Results

Table I

Q-1

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	1	3	4	7	2
Student	0	2	0	3	4

Table J

Q-2

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	10	7	0	0	0
Student	3	4	1	0	1

Table K

Q-3

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	0	5	2	6	4
Student	1	2	2	2	2

Table L

Q-4

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	0	6	1	7	3
Student	3	2	4	0	0

Table M

Q-5

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	6	10	1	0	0
Student	0	2	3	2	2

Table N

Q-6

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	2	10	3	2	0
Student	2	1	2	3	1

## Resource Results

Table O

Q-7

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	1	7	2	5	2
Student	2	5	1	1	0

Table P

Q-8

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	7	7	1	2	0
Student	1	4	3	0	1

### Key

1= Strongly Agree

2= Agree

3= Undecided

4= Disagree

5= Strongly Disagree

# Section III

## Self-Contained Results

Table Q

Q-1

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	1	3	1	4	3
Student	1	0	3	6	1

Table R

Q-2

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	10	1	1	0	0
Student	2	7	2	0	0

Table S

Q-3

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	1	0	1	8	2
Student	0	0	3	8	0

Table T

Q-4

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	0	1	1	4	5
Student	1	4	2	4	0

Table U

Q-5

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	5	5	0	2	0
Student	0	6	2	2	1

Table V

Q-6

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	2	8	2	0	0
Student	0	2	3	6	0

# Self-Contained Results

Table W

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	1	6	1	3	1
Student	1	5	3	1	1

Q-7

Table X

	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher	8	3	0	1	0
Student	3	4	2	2	0

Q-8

## Key

1= Strongly Agree

2= Agree

3= Undecided

4= Disagree

5= Strongly Disagree



## THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Under the authority conferred upon the Bureau by the Act of March 3, 1879, and the Act of March 3, 1909, the following report is submitted:

### I. WORK ACCOMPLISHED

- |                                      |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| a. Research and development work     | Completed 100% |
| b. Standardization work              | Completed 100% |
| c. Testing of the work of the Bureau | Completed 100% |
| d. Other work                        | Completed 100% |

### II. SUMMARY OF RESULTS, 1940-1941 APPENDIX D

- |                                      |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| a. Research and development work     | Completed 100% |
| b. Standardization work              | Completed 100% |
| c. Testing of the work of the Bureau | Completed 100% |
| d. Other work                        | Completed 100% |

### III. SUMMARY OF RESULTS, 1942-1943

- |                                  |                |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| a. Research and development work | Completed 100% |
|----------------------------------|----------------|

### IV. SUMMARY OF RESULTS, 1944-1945

- |                                  |                |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| a. Research and development work | Completed 100% |
| b. Standardization work          | Completed 100% |

### V. SUMMARY OF RESULTS, 1946-1947

- |                                  |                |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| a. Research and development work | Completed 100% |
| b. Standardization work          | Completed 100% |

These results are based on the work of the Bureau during the year 1947.

## Six Factors Related to Burnout in Special Education

Each factor or sub-factor has the corresponding question number from the questionnaire which it addresses.

### 1. Work Overload

- a. Planning and Implementing P.L. 94-142 (Questions: 2, 7 )
- b. Counseling with each child's parents (Questions: 8 )
- c. Working with each student (Questions: 4, 5)
- d. Doing non-teaching duties (Questions: 3)

### 2. Lack of Perceived Success

- a. Little observable student progress (Statement: 3)

### 3. Amount of Direct Contact with Students

- a. Little time away from their exceptional students (Statement: 8)
- b. Limited interaction with colleagues (Statement: 4  
Question: 6)

### 4. Program Structure

- a. Flexible and less structured programs (Statement: 5)

### 5. Responsibility for others

- a. Little emotional support from students, parents, or colleagues (Statement: 1, 5)

### 6. Role Clarification

- a. Weak role descriptions (Statement: 2)
- b. Changing definitions, procedures, forms to use and emphasis of program (Statement: 7)

\*Note: Questions are in Section II and Statements are in Section III.

McDonald, the first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

On the 10th of January and the 11th of January, 1968, the first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

The first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

The first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

The first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

The first of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party" and the second of whom was a member of the "Black Panther Party".

Without the help of some very special people, it is doubtful that I would have finished this thesis paper.

First, to Dr. Jenkins and the Chancellor Scholar's Council, thank-you for giving me the opportunity to test my intellectual abilities through this thesis paper and all the other courses within the Chancellor Scholarship Program. They have provided me with a vast amount of knowledge about myself and others that will never be forgotten.

Words cannot describe the admiration I have for Dr. Schultz, Dr. Sullivan and Dr. Brown. My appreciation for their help and guidance is beyond the scope of this simple acknowledgement. Their knowledge and support provided me with the necessary skills to complete this thesis paper.

I would also like to thank Mr. Julian Butler for his help in administering the Teacher Questionnaire for me. I truly appreciate him taking time out of his hectic schedule to do this for me. Without his involvement, this study would have been incomplete.

I cannot forget my sister-in-law, Wanda, who aided me tremendously with some of the typing. I owe you one!

And finally, to Jimmy, Mom, and Dad: I MADE IT!!! But I could not have done it without your help, support and belief in me. I know it has been rough putting up with me these couple of months. I love you all very much. THANKS!!!

1. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 1-10.

2. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 11-20.

3. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 21-30.

4. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 31-40.

5. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 41-50.

6. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 51-60.

7. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 61-70.

8. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 71-80.

# REFERENCES

1. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 1-10.

2. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 11-20.

3. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 21-30.

4. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 31-40.

5. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 41-50.

6. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 51-60.

7. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 61-70.

8. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 71-80.

9. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1977, 70, 81-90.

## Bibliography

- Abernathy, S. Manera, E., and Wright, R. "What Stresss Student Teachers Most?" Clearing House. April 1982, p. 361-362.
- Batten, Julie. "10 Jobs That Cause Burnout". Business Week's Guide to Careers. Vol. 3 n. 6 Winter 1985/86, p. 41-43.
- Bensky, J. M., Shaw, S.G., Gouse, A.S., Bates, H., Dison, B., And Beane, W.E. "P.L. 94-142 and Stress: A Problem for Educators." Exceptional Children. vol.47 1980, p.24-29.
- Blase, J.J. "The Phenomenology of Teacher Stress: Implications for Organizational Theory and Research." Administrators Notebook. vol. 31 n.7, 1985, p.1-4.
- Bradfield, R.H., and Fones, D.M. "Special Teacher Stress: Its Product and Prevention." Academic Therapy. vol. 21 n. 1, September 1985, p.91-97.
- Bradfield, R.H., and Fones, D.M. "Stress and Special Teacher: How Bad Is It?" Academic Therapy. vol.20n.5, May, 1985,p. 571-577.
- Crane, S., and Iwansicki, E. "Perceived Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Burnout Among Special Education Teachers." Remedial and Special Education. vol.7, n.2, March-April, 1986,p.24-31.
- Davis, William. The Special Education. Austin,Texas: PRO-ED, Inc. 1983.
- Eskridge, D., and Coker, D. "Teacher Stress: Symptons, Causes, and Management Techniques." Clearinghouse. vol. 58, May, 1985,p.387-90.
- Fimian, M.J., Pierson, D. and McHardy, R. "occupational Stress Reported by Teachers of Learning Disabled and Nonlearning Disabled Handicapped Students." Journal of Learning Disabilities. vol.19n.3, March, 1986,p.154-158.
- Fimian, M.J. "Social Support and Occupational Stress In Special Education." Exceptioanl Children. vol. 52 n.5, February, 1986, p.436-442.
- Fimian, M.J., Zacherman, J., and McHardy, R. "Substance Abuse and Teacher Stress." Journal of Drug Education. vol.15n.2, 1985,p. 139-155.
- Fimian, M., and Blanton, L. "Variables Related to Stress and Burnout in Special Eduaction Teacher Trainees and First-Year Teachers." Teachers Education and Special Education. vol.9 n.1, Winter, 1986,p.9-21.
- Fimian, M. and Santoro, T. "Sources and Manifestations of Occupational Stress as Reported by Full-Time Special Education Teachers." Exceptional Children. vol.49 n.6, 1983, p.540-543.
- Freudenberger, Herbert. "Burnout: Occupational Hazard of The Child Care Worker." Child Care Quarterly. vol.56. 1977,p.90-99.
- Gold, Yvonne. "Does Teacher Burnout Begin With Student Teaching?" Education. vol. 105n. 3, Spring 1985, p.254-257.

- Greenberg, S.F., and Valletutti, P.J. Stress and the Helping Professions. Baltimore Md.: Paul H. Brook Publishers. 1980.
- Halpin, G., Harris, K., and Halpin, G. "Teacher Stress As Related to Locus of Control, Sex, and Age." Journal of Experimental Education. vol. 53 n. 3, Spring 1985, p. 136-140.
- Kiffs, S. "Combatting Teacher Burnout." Business Education Forum. vol. 40, April-May, 1986, p. 15-18.
- Kyriacou, C., and Sutcliffe, J. "Teacher Stress: Prevalence, Sources, and Symptoms." British Journal of Educational Psychology. vol. 58, 1978, p. 159-167.
- Lawrenson, G., and McKinnon, A. "A Survey of Classroom Teachers of the Emotionally Disturbed: Attrition and Burnout Factors." Behavioral Disorders. vol. 8. 1982, p. 41-49.
- Maslach, C. Burnout-The Cost of Caring. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. 1982.
- Maslach, C. and Jackson, S.E. "The Measurement of Experience Burnout." Journal of Occupational Behavior. vol. 2, 1982, p. 99-113.
- Morsink, Catherine. "Changes in the Role of Special Education: Public Perceptions and Demands." Exceptional Education Quarterly. February 1982, p. 15-25.
- Olson, J., and Matuskey, P. "Causes of Burnout in Specific Learning Disabled Teachers.." Journal of Learning Disabilities. vol. 15 n. 2, 1982, p. 97-99.
- Perlman, B. and Hartman, A. "Burnout: Summary and Future Research." Human Relations. vol. 35 n. 4. 1982, p. 283-305.
- Pines, A., and Aronson, E. with Kafry, D. Burnout: From Tedium to Personal Growth. New York: Free Press. 1981.
- Raschke, D. Dedrick, C. Strathe, M., and Haukes, R. "Teacher Stress: The Elementary Teacher's Perspective." The Elementary School Journal. vol. 85 n. 4, 1985, p. 559-564.
- Sarason, S. Davidson, K., and Blatt, B. The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- Schmid, R.E., and Nagata, L.M. Contemporary Issues in Special Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1983.
- Selye, H. The Stress of Life. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1978.
- Shaw, S.F., Bensky, J.M., and Dixon, B. Stress and Burnout: A Primer for Special Education and Special Services Personnel. Reston, Virginia: CEC/ERIC Publications. 1981.
- Sylvester, R. "Stress!" Instruction Magazine. vol. 86, 1977, p. 72-78.
- "Teacher Burnout." USA TODAY. vol. 113 n. 2479, April, 1985. p. 8-9.



Truch, S. Teacher Burnout and What to do About it. Novato, Cal.: Academic Therapy Publications. 1978.

Weiskopf, P.E. "Burnout Among Teachers of Exceptional Children." Exceptional Children vol. 47 n.1, September 1980, p.18-23.

Whiteman, J. Ywonne, J. and Fisher, L. "Teacher Burnout and the Perception of Student Behavior." Education. vol.105 n.3, p. 299-304.

Wilson, C.F. and Hall, D.L. Preventing Burnout in Education. La Mesa, Cal.: The Wright Group. 1981.

Ysseldyke, J.E., and Algozzine, B. Critical Issues in Special and Remedial Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1982.